

ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS  
ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF  
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES  
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2018 TO DECEMBER 31, 2018

Submitted Pursuant to  
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Ajit Pai, Chairman

December 19, 2019

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading	Page #
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
II. KEY FINDINGS .....	3
III. BACKGROUND.....	4
IV. DISCUSSION .....	4
A. Summary of Reporting Methodology .....	5
B. Overview of State 911 Systems .....	5
C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism .....	16
D. Description of State Authority that Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent .....	19
E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees .....	21
F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected .....	28
G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses .....	39
1. States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds. ....	40
2. States/Jurisdictions Identified by the Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds. ....	41
3. Other Jurisdictions.....	44
H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees.....	47
I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures.....	50
J. Cybersecurity Expenditures.....	66
K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees.....	72
L. Public Comments on 2018 Tenth Annual Report .....	72
V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2019 ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT .....	76
Appendix A – Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding 2018 Collections	
Appendix B – Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2009 – 2018	
Appendix C – State 911 Fees by Service Type	
Appendix D – Information Collection Questionnaire	

### I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman, Federal Communications Commission (Commission),<sup>1</sup> hereby submits this Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, as mandated by the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (NET 911 Act)<sup>2</sup> and as prepared by the staff in the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (Bureau).<sup>3</sup> This is the eleventh annual report on the collection and distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 (E911) fees and charges by the states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and tribal authorities, and covers the period January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018. This report also reflects the sixth annual collection of new data elements relating to the number of 911 call centers and telecommunicators, 911 call volumes, 911 expenditure categories, implementation of Next Generation 911, and cybersecurity for 911 systems.

---

<sup>1</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 155(a) (stating, *inter alia*, that “[i]t shall be [the Chairman’s] duty . . . to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports”).

<sup>2</sup> New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-283, 122 Stat. 2620 (2008) (NET 911 Act).

<sup>3</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 0.191(k) (providing delegated authority to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to develop responses to legislative inquiries).

## II. KEY FINDINGS

2. Fifty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands responded to this year's data request. The following is a compilation of key findings based on the responses:

- In calendar year 2018, states and other reporting jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees or charges totaling \$2,675,270,976.
- Twenty-six states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported collecting 911/E911 fees at the state level, four states reported collecting fees at the local level, and 18 states collected fees at both the state and local level.
- The Bureau identified five states (Nevada,<sup>4</sup> New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and West Virginia) as diverting or transferring 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911 in 2018.
  - All five states used a portion of their 911/E911 funds to support non-911 related public safety programs.
  - New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and West Virginia used a portion of their 911/E911 funds for either non-public safety or unspecified uses.
  - The total amount of 911/E911 funds diverted by all reporting jurisdictions in calendar year 2018 was \$187,085,044.92, or approximately 7.0% of all 911/E911 fees collected.
- Thirty-six states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reported engaging in Next Generation 911 (NG911) programs in calendar year 2018. The total amount of reported NG911 expenditures from 911/E911 fees was \$228,538,053.28, or approximately 9% of total 911/E911 fees collected.
- Eighteen states reported having deployed state-wide Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets). Fourteen states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and nine states reported local-level ESInets.
- Fifty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported on deployment of text-to-911. Collectively, respondents reported 2,093 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2018, and projected that an additional 1,039 PSAPs would be text-capable by the end of 2019, for a total of 3,132 text capable PSAPs.
- While almost every state collects 911 fees from in-state subscribers, 16 states and the District of Columbia reported that they lack authority to audit service providers to verify that the collected fees accurately reflect the number of in-state subscribers served by the provider. Of the jurisdictions that have audit authority, nine states and Puerto Rico conducted audits in 2018.

---

<sup>4</sup> As noted in Section IV.G below, Nevada did not divert 911 fees at the state level. However, the Bureau concludes that one local jurisdiction diverted 911 fees in 2018.

- On the topic of cybersecurity preparedness for Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), 31 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they spent no 911 funds in 2018 on 911-related cybersecurity programs for PSAPs. Eighteen states and the District of Columbia stated that they had made cybersecurity-related expenditures.

### III. BACKGROUND

3. Section 101 of the NET 911 Act added a new section 6(f)(2) to the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Wireless 911 Act), which provides:

To ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the collection and expenditure of a fee or charge for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services, the Commission shall submit a report within 1 year after the date of enactment of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, and annually thereafter, to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.

4. *Information Request and Responses.* In April 2019, the Bureau sent questionnaires to the Governor of each state and territory and the Mayor of the District of Columbia requesting information on 911 fee collection and expenditure for calendar year 2018.<sup>5</sup> The Bureau received responsive information from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.<sup>6</sup> The Bureau did not receive any response from American Samoa.

### IV. DISCUSSION

5. This Report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2018, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds.<sup>7</sup> The Report describes the extent to which states diverted or transferred collected 911/E911 funds to funds or programs other than those that support or implement 911/E911 services. The report also examines the collection and expenditure of funds on NG911 and cybersecurity programs.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix D - Annual Collection of Information Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions (FCC Questionnaire). As last year, this year's data collection incorporates recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in its April 2013 report on state collection and use of 911 funds. See Government Accountability Office, "Most States Used 911 Funds for Intended Purposes, but FCC Could Improve Its Reporting on States' Use of Funds," GAO-13-376 (Apr. 2013) (GAO Report). GAO prepared this report pursuant to a directive in the Next Generation 911 Advancement Act of 2012. See Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-96, 126 Stat. 158 (2012). In previous years, the Bureau has sent questionnaires to the regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), but these offices have either failed to respond, indicated they have no responsive information, or requested that they not be contacted. Accordingly, as last year, the Bureau did not include the BIA regional offices in this year's data collection.

<sup>6</sup> Copies of reports from all responding jurisdictions are available on the FCC web site at <https://www.fcc.gov/eleventh-annual-fee-report-state-filings-0>.

<sup>7</sup> Our analysis includes states that collect and distribute fees over the course of a fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year covered by our reports.

## A. Summary of Reporting Methodology

6. Section 6(f)(1) of the Act affirms the ability of “[a] State, political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or village or regional corporation serving a region established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended ...” to collect fees or charges “[applicable] to commercial mobile services or IP-enabled voice services ... for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services, provided that the fee or charge is obligated or expended only in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services, *as specified in the provision of State or local law adopting the fee or charge.*”<sup>8</sup> Section 6(f)(2) further requires the Commission to obtain information “detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof *for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.*”<sup>9</sup>

7. Given the NET 911 Act’s reference to state and local 911 fee statutes, our state-by-state analysis of 911/E911 fee expenditures in this report is determined by the applicable statute governing the collection and expenditure of 911/E911 fees within each state. States determine how 911/E911 fee revenues are to be spent, therefore, individual state definitions of what constitute permissible expenditures may vary. The Bureau’s information collection questionnaire asks each state to confirm whether it has spent 911/E911 funds solely for purposes permitted under the particular state’s 911 funding statute, and also requests information on what uses are deemed permissible under the state’s statute and how such uses support 911 or E911 service. Although some state statutes expressly authorize the diversion or transfer of collected 911/E911 fees, the Bureau reviews the reported expenditures to determine whether such diversions or transfers are not “in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services” within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. The report on 911/E911 fee diversion in Section G below is consistent with this interpretation.

## B. Overview of State 911 Systems

8. To provide a broader context for the information provided on collection and use of 911 fees, the data collection sought information about the total number of PSAPs that receive funding derived from the collection of 911 fees, the number of active telecommunicators funded through the collection of 911 fees, the total number and type of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received, and an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service.<sup>10</sup>

9. **Number and Type of PSAPs.** The questionnaire requested that states “provide the total number of active [Primary and Secondary PSAPs]<sup>11</sup> in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2018.” Table 1 shows that 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this request, reporting a total of 4,468 Primary PSAPs and 686

---

<sup>8</sup> NET 911 Act at § 6(f)(1) (emphasis added).

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at § 6(f)(2) (emphasis added).

<sup>10</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 2-3.

<sup>11</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control Office. A Secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (NENA Master Glossary) (April 13, 2018) at 162, [https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.22-2018\\_FINAL\\_2.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.22-2018_FINAL_2.pdf).

Secondary PSAPs, for a total of 5,154 PSAPs dependent on funding derived from the collection of 911 fees.<sup>12</sup>

**Table 1 - Number and Types of PSAPs that Receive Funding from the Collection of 911 Fees**

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
AK	40	5	45
AL	119	42	161
AR	102	25	127
AZ	74	10	84
CA	388	50	438
CO	83	5	88
CT	104	4	108
DE	8	1	9
FL	147	54	201
GA	154	Unknown	154
HI	5	3	8
IA	113	Unknown	113
ID	46	4	50
IL	188	11	199
IN	91	31	122
KS	117	None	117
KY	115	[Unknown] <sup>13</sup>	115
LA	84	None	84
MA	231	51	282
MD	24	70	94
ME	24	[No Response]	24
MI	137	None	137
MN	97	5	102
MO	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
MS	116	32	148
MT	50	[Unknown]	50

<sup>12</sup> We note that because the Bureau's data request focused on PSAPs that receive funding from 911 fees, the reported data do not necessarily include PSAPs that are funded through sources other than 911 fees.

<sup>13</sup> In all tables in this report, brackets indicate information entered by the Bureau, e.g., where the state or jurisdiction has provided no response or the response is unknown because it cannot be derived from the information provided in the state or jurisdiction's filing. Except as noted, all unbracketed table entries are taken verbatim from the responses provided by states and jurisdictions.

NC	115	12	127
ND	21	1	22
NE	69	None	69
NH	2	[No Response]	2
NJ	None	None	None
NM	41	None	41
NV	9	3	12
NY	133	43	176
OH	138	38	176
OK	131	Unknown	131
OR	43	14	57
PA	69	None	69
RI	1	1	2
SC	69	11	80
SD	28	None	28
TN	140	30	170
TX	505	72	577
UT	31	None	31
VA	119	41	160
VT	6	[No Response]	6
WA	51	14	65
WI	None	None	None
WV	51	[No Response]	51
WY	33	3	36
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>			
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	1	None	1
Guam	1	None	1
NMI	None	None	None
PR	2	None	2
USVI	2	[No Response]	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,468</b>	<b>686</b>	<b>5,154</b>

10. **Number of Telecommunicators.** Respondents were asked to provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>14</sup> in each state or territory that were funded through the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2018. As detailed in Table 2 below, 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this data request. These states and other jurisdictions reported a total of 39,124 full time telecommunicators and 3,503 part-time telecommunicators that are funded through the collection of 911 fees. Seven states reported they do not know how telecommunicators are funded, and eight states and the Northern Mariana Islands reported they are not funded by 911 fees; i.e., they provided responses of “0” or none.

**Table 2 – Total Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees**

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Reported “Unknown”	Not Funded by Fees	Provided No Response
AK	272	12			
AL	2130	Unknown			
AR	1,005	175			
AZ	None	None		X	
CA	None	None		X	
CO	589	16			
CT	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	X		
DE	288	8			
FL	1,787	168			
GA	Unknown	Unknown	X		
HI	None	None		X	
IA	Unknown	Unknown	X		
ID	Unknown	Unknown	X		
IL	3109	418			
IN	1805	325			
KS	1,028	102			
KY	1,324	285			
LA	783	3			
MA	5,000	[NA] <sup>15</sup>			

<sup>14</sup> A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a “person employed by a PSAP and/or an [Emergency Medical Dispatch] Service Provider qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP.” See NENA Master Glossary at 192.

<sup>15</sup> Massachusetts reports that the number of part-time telecommunicators is included in the full-time response. Massachusetts Response at 2.



MD	1,500	100			
ME	None	None		X	
MI	1,956	216			
MN	None	None		X	
MO	Unknown	Unknown	X		
MS	1,041	297			
MT	NA	NA			
NC	[None]	[None]		X	
ND	250	20			
NE	549	83			
NH	49	10			
NJ	None	None		X	
NM	None	None		X	
NV	55	4			
NY	5535	376			
OH	659.5	100.0			
OK	165.0	None			
OR	894.6	[Unknown]			
PA	2,100	280			
RI	32	None			
SC	[No Response]	[No Response]			X
SD	283	44			
TN	Unknown	Unknown	X		
TX	745	18			
UT	658	104			
VA	1075	Unknown			
VT	85	23			
WA	1,365	162			
WI	None	None			
WV	698	154			
WY	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	X		
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>					
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]			X
DC	88	None			
Guam	21	None			
NMI	0	0		X	

PR	157	None			
USVI	37	None			
Total	39,124.1	3,503	7	9	3

11. **Number of 911/E911 Calls.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total number of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received for the annual period ending December 31, 2018. Forty-five states, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a cumulative total of 213,840,824 calls of all types during the 2018 annual period. This total is lower than the reported call volume for the 2017 annual reporting period, which totaled 222,097,267 calls.<sup>16</sup> Of the total reported calls in 2018, 149,605,690 calls came from wireless phones, representing approximately 70% of the total reported call volume. The Bureau believes this likely understates the percentage of wireless 911 calls because a number of states reported total 911 calls but did not break out service categories separately.<sup>17</sup> Table 3 provides specific call volume information provided by each state or other jurisdiction for each service type. In addition, the Bureau has included an estimate of annual 911 calls on a per capita basis in each reporting state and jurisdiction.

**Table 3 – Total 911 Calls by Service Type**

State	Type of Service						Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita <sup>18</sup>
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Reported “Unknown”	
AK	73,112	489,358	Unknown	Unknown	562,480		0.76
AL	[Unknown]	2,560,564	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	X	[No Value] <sup>19</sup>
AR	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]		[No Value]
AZ	604,624	3,557,435	49,427	161,471	4,372,957		0.61
CA	3,136,490	21,755,763	1,144,924	953,762	27,018,953		0.68
CO	247,792	5,911,601	189,710	80,652	6,429,755		1.13
CT	312,744	1,725,584	134,167	1,616	2,174,111		0.61
DE	130,251	533,446	62,747	61,364	787,808		0.81
FL	1,810,262	11,515,622	585,950	327,986	14,239,820		0.67
GA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	[No Response]	X	[No Value]

<sup>16</sup> In the Tenth Annual Report (2018), forty-four states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported a total of 222,097,267 calls for calendar year 2017. See FCC, Tenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges at 13 (2018) (Tenth Report), <https://www.fcc.gov/files/10thannual911feereporttocongresspdf>.

<sup>17</sup> Six states and jurisdictions reported total 911 call volumes but did not provide service category subtotals.

<sup>18</sup> The Bureau’s per capita estimate is based on United States 2010 Census data for each jurisdiction. Guam’s population is based on World Bank data because census data are unavailable. See Population, Guam, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=GU&view=chart> (last visited November 7, 2019).

<sup>19</sup> In this column, [No Value] denotes that it is not possible to calculate the estimated annual 911 calls per capita because the number of 911 calls is unknown or unavailable.

HI	297,767	1,026,723	55,546	7,022	1,387,058		0.98
IA	215,312	914,327	30,057	1,714	1,161,410		0.37
ID	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	Unknown	X	[No Value]
IL	1,792,018	6,833,791	346,689	2,024	9,200,041		0.72
IN	392,870	2,975,795	192,298	215,784	3,776,747		0.56
KS	417,094	1,270,702	51,607	3,692	1,743,095		0.60
KY	635,755	2,371,925	113,289	[No Response]	3,120,969		0.70
LA	1,158,369	2,898,481	62,224	1,691	4,120,765		0.88
MA	594,313	2,980,623	377,128	2,861	3,954,925		0.57
MD	1,252,779	3,531,344	NA	375	4,784,498		0.79
ME	113,783	395,564	52,810	[No Response]	562,157		0.42
MI	1,071,606	5,219,965	355,773	6,390	6,653,734		0.67
MN	426,813	2,353,055	144,451	11	2,924,330		0.52
MO	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	X	[No Value]
MS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	3,531,773		1.18
MT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		[No Value]
NC	955,771	5,651,475	622,755	[No Response]	7,230,001		0.70
ND	22,886	141,264	2,108	3,906	170,164		0.22
NE	199,702	791,357	15,639	124,369	1,131,067		0.59
NH	49,018	308,896	50,208	13,425	421,547		0.31
NJ	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	9,000,000		1.01
NM	662,234	1,240,599	33,764	21,196	1,967,025		0.94
NV	167,760	1,000,810	14,598	344,549	1,527,717		0.50
NY	6,520,473	12,275,788	916,827	5,177,781	24,890,869		1.27
OH	769,955	5,301,420	447,835	115,075	6,761,648		0.58
OK	758923	2185065	Inc. in Wireless	138575	3082563		0.78
OR	228,001	1,558,638	96,528	69,646	1,952,813		0.47
PA	2,086,248	5,771,683	530,441	4,496	8,393,318		0.66
RI	92,255	368,963	Included in Wireless Count	None	461,218		0.44
SC	856,023	3,570,302	151,513	2,931	4,580,769		0.90
SD	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	332,721		0.38
TN	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	X	[No Value]
TX	2,065,023	15,664,166	794,428	269,291	18,792,908		0.65
UT	89,094	820,760	34,783	None	944,637		0.30

VA	939,017	3,079,553	[No Response]	[No Response]	4,018,570		0.47
VT	39,431	137,889	20,944	6,673	204,937		0.33
WA	642,777	5,644,226	511,831	3,957	6,802,791		0.90
WI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	2,848,294		0
WV	714,569	955,321	154,741	443,874	2,268,505		1.26
WY	25,705	216,310	2,328	8,148	252,491		0.44
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>							
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]		[No Value]
DC	188,631	846,255	50,598	193,389	1,278,873		1.82
Guam	32,841	None	None	None	32,841		0.20
NMI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		[No Value]
PR	64,047	1,253,282	None	427,822	1,745,151		0.55
USVI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	240,000		2.24
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32854138</b>	<b>149,605,690</b>	<b>8,400,666</b>	<b>9,197,518</b>	<b>213,840,824</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0.65</b>

12. **Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911 service during the annual period ending December 31, 2018, regardless of whether such costs are supported by 911 fees or other funding sources. As detailed in Table 4 below, 37 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands provided cost estimates totaling \$5,005,131,222.<sup>20</sup> Table 4 also includes the Bureau's estimate of reported costs on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Thirteen states and the Northern Mariana Islands did not provide cost estimates, with many of the respondents noting that they lacked authority to collect 911 cost data from local jurisdictions. Some states that did submit estimates qualified their cost figures by noting that they had only partial information regarding the total cost to provide 911 service.<sup>21</sup>

**Table 4 – Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service**

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures
AK	\$14,200,672	[No Response]	\$19.26
AL	\$106,276,266	[No Response]	\$21.74
AR	[No Response]	Due to the number of outstanding 2019 PSAP Certifications, this data is not yet available. Note: It is anticipated that this data will be available by mid-July. <sup>22</sup>	NA

<sup>20</sup> For a comparison of total costs to total revenue from fees and charges, see Table 13.

<sup>21</sup> States lacking complete information include Kansas, Maryland, and Maine.

<sup>22</sup> As of the release date of this report, Arkansas has not updated its response with the total estimated cost to provide 911 service.

AZ	\$17,364,937	NA	\$2.42
CA	\$108,206,000	[No Response]	\$2.74
CO	[Unknown]	911 expenses are locally controlled and public safety answering points are not required to report expenses to the State 911 Program Manager. A survey of the PSAPs did not yield sufficient data points to provide an estimate.	[Unknown]
CT	\$29,770,053	[No Response]	\$8.33
DE	\$9,400,000	[No Response]	\$9.72
FL	\$222,556,957	NA	\$10.45
GA	Unknown	The Georgia Emergency Communications Authority (GECA) does not capture that information at this time since we do not cover any costs of 911 operations in the state.	NA
HI	Unknown	Hawaii is a “home rule” state and each county has its own cost accounting system which the E911 Board has no authority over. Their system is not set up to capture expenses associated with 911/E911 service only. As a result, the counties must perform this task manually which creates other problems such as accuracy and time constraints. We will undergo an effort to work with the PSAPs to assist in accomplishing the task through modification of their cost accounting system. Hopefully the matter will be resolved by this time next year.	Unknown
IA	\$152,707,692	[No Response]	\$48.38
ID	Unknown at aggregated State Level	The cost of providing 911 services is kept at each of the jurisdictional levels and requests can be made for that data; however it is incomplete. The cost responses were not broken out sufficiently to give a solid number and only 20 of 46 PSAPs responded to the request with some responses as “unknown”. Due to some responses being intermingled with 911 costs paid by the 911 fees and personnel costs that were paid for by General Funds, not all responses could be calculated and not all jurisdictions reported on the survey that was sent out to gather the information.	NA
IL	\$327,457,172	Local 9-1-1 Authorities report \$315,803,099 in 9-1-1 expenses and the State incurred \$11,654,073 for 9-1-1 network costs. Totaling \$327,457,172 in 9-1-1 Expenses. (Includes City of Chicago expenses)	\$25.70
IN	\$194,787,842	[No Response]	\$29.11
KS	\$105,737,626	The amount shown does not include data from 12 PSAPs who failed to provide the information after multiple requests.	\$36.32
KY	\$116,658,320	Our PSAP surveys are reported on a fiscal year basis. The number above reflect cost based upon FY2018 (July 1, 2017 thru June 30, 2018. All numbers in this report reflect data from the same period of time, unless otherwise noted.	\$26.11
LA	\$89,897,894	[No Response]	\$19.29

MA	\$38,645,635	The estimated amount to provide 911 Service is: \$38,645,635 This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the Next Generation 911 service provider contract, MassGIS, Radio, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department.	\$5.60
MD	\$115,533,086	Fiscal Year 2018 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018) as reported by county annual audits. This amount may not reflect the total cost for the 70 secondary PSAPs, who do not fall under the state 911 regulatory authority.	\$19.12
ME	\$6,830,314	The State of Maine provides for a statewide 911 system. The cost above is limited to the services we provide. We do not collect information on the local costs of PSAPs not funded through the E911 surcharge.	\$5.10
MI	\$265,304,541	[No Response]	\$26.54
MN	\$9,499,056	[No Response]	\$1.69
MO	Unknown	PSAP's are 100% funded by local jurisdictions. They do not file any financial documents with the state yet.	NA
MS	\$64,819,628.69	[No Response]	\$21.70
MT	NA	Per Montana Code Annotated (MCA) Title 10, Chapter 4 the Montana Legislature has delegated the responsibility for hosting public safety answering points (PSAPs) to local government entities. Local government entities are not required to report the total cost of providing 911 services to the State of Montana.	NA
NC	\$126,224,104	[No Response]	\$12.16
ND	\$18,500,000	[No Response]	\$24.34
NE	Unknown	The Nebraska Public Service Commission (NPSC) provides statewide coordination and support. An annual allocation of wireless 911 surcharge revenue is distributed to the PSAPs. The PSC does not have information regarding the costs to run the PSAPs at this time.	NA
NH	\$13,840,224	[No Response]	\$10.20
NJ	Unknown	The State of New Jersey funds the statewide enhanced 9-1-1 infrastructure at an annual cost of approximately \$14M, the operational, equipment and personnel costs are the responsibility of the PSAP and not reported to the State 9-1-1 Office.	NA
NM	\$8,561,378	[No Response]	\$4.09
NV	\$7,562,104	[No Response]	\$2.49
NY	\$1,104,060,030.00	[No Response]	\$56.50
OH	\$354,344,577	Answer to #3 is total of all reported spending by county - *See attached spreadsheet for specific counties.	\$30.31
OK	\$90,500,000.00	[No Response]	\$22.95

OR	\$146,170,611	NA	\$34.88
PA	\$348,920,207	[No Response]	\$27.24
RI	\$5,186,447	[No Response]	\$4.91
SC	[No Response]	We do not collect that type of information. The State 911 office only deals with wireless 911 and the distribution of wireless 911 surcharges back to the PSAPs.	NA
SD	\$27,481,502	[No Response]	\$31.15
TN	\$113,898,014	[No Response]	\$16.82
TX	\$283,736,341	[No Response]	\$9.89
UT	\$65,000,000	[No Response]	\$20.56
VA	Unknown	For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, PSC staff only sees funds that are collected by the Virginia Department of Taxation as part of the Wireless E9-1-1 Fund. We do not collect information on any other costs.	NA
VT	\$4,831,183	[No Response]	\$7.71
WA	\$150,000,000	* This is based on costs reported from the counties. Numbers were estimated for counties with incomplete data. This includes 9-1-1 costs of equipment, maintenance, call taker/coordinator/MSAG/GIS/IT salary/benefits and training. It also includes critical support items which are eligible and make up approximately 30% of the total, including administrative support, legal, building leases, supplies, etc.	\$19.91
WI	Unknown	In Wisconsin, county and municipal governments operate and administer the 9-1-1 systems and all public safety answering points. County and municipal governments do not report to any state agency the number of staff employed, the total cost to provide 9-1-1 services, or a statistical summary of the 9-1-1 service provided. Each county and some municipalities in Wisconsin have entered into a contract with participating local exchange carriers to provide its 9-1-1 telecommunications network. These 9-1-1 contracts specify in detail the design of the telecommunications network supporting the local 9-1-1 service, authorizes a 9-1-1 surcharge to pay for expenses related to the network, and identifies the obligations of the parties to build, operate, and maintain the 9-1-1 telecommunications network. See Wis. Stat. 256.35(3)(b). No portion of the funds collected from the 9-1-1 surcharge is shared with any state, county, or municipal agency or department, or any other governmental entity. The 9-1-1 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expenses for providing the 9-1-1 service, and is retained in full by the participating local exchange carriers (up to \$0.40 cents per exchange access line per month). County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 9-1-1 calls are paid for through the	NA

		respective county and municipal budgets. The total amount of the 9-1-1 surcharge collection is not available. The participating local exchange carriers collect the 9-1-1 surcharge. Those local exchange carriers do not report the results of the 9-1-1 surcharge collection to any state, county, or municipal office.	
WV	\$73,631,161	[No Response]	\$40.77
WY	[Unknown]	On March 8, 2019, Governor Mark Gordon signed House Bill 161, which assigned the 9-1-1 Coordinator to be located at WYDOT. On May 10, 2019, Governor Gordon, designated the assignment to WYDOT-Emergency Communications Program Manager – Troy Babbitt. Wyoming will begin the coordination of collecting 9-1-1 information, for next year’s report. Before this; According to Title 16, Chapter 9 of the Wyoming State Statutes for the emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign over-sight responsibility to a state-level agency for 9-1-1 services. (16-9-102(a)(iv).	NA
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>			
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	NA
DC	\$47,708,267	[No Response]	\$67.92
Guam	\$1,490,964.00	[No Response]	\$8.99
NMI	[No Response]	The CNMI currently does not receive fees for 911 services. Annual appropriations by state and local municipalities fund 911 operations. The CNMI does not have an E911/NG911 system in place. We do not have any PSAPs. The CNMI Department of Public Safety (DPS) currently answers all 911 calls which is basically four telephone land lines to individual telephone handsets.	NA
PR	\$13,864,255.12	NA	\$4.34
USVI	\$3,966,163	[No Response]	\$37.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,005,131,222</b>	<b>Average State Per Capita Expenditure</b> <b>National Per Capita Expenditure</b>	<b>\$20.35</b> <b>\$15.30</b>

### C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism

13. The Bureau’s questionnaire seeks data on the funding mechanisms states use to collect fees. Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands affirmed that their state or jurisdiction has established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation.<sup>23</sup> Of those states that have an established funding mechanism, Table 5 identifies seven states that enlarged or altered their funding mechanism during calendar year 2018. Specifically, each of these seven states amended its fee structure. For example, Alabama adjusted its 911 charge by an amount equal to the rate of growth of the Consumer Price Index

<sup>23</sup> Missouri and the Northern Mariana Islands report that they have not established a funding mechanism. Missouri Response at 3; Northern Mariana Islands Response at 3.



for Urban Consumers (CPI-U).<sup>24</sup> Georgia increased prepaid 911 charges, reduced the administrative fee retained by vendors, and stopped vendors from charging cost recovery to local governments.<sup>25</sup>

**Table 5 – States That Amended or Enlarged 911 Funding Mechanism**

State	Description
Alabama	Yes. Under § 11-98-5, Code of Alabama 1975, no later than October 1, 2018 and each fifth year after, the state board is required to adjust the 911 charge an amount equal to the rate of growth, based on the Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for that five-year period. During 2018, the rate of growth was determined, and the administrative rules process was used to establish the new 911 charge of \$1.86 and increased baseline distribution amounts to local districts. Service providers were required to begin remitting at this rate on January 1, 2019.
Florida	The E911 Board voted to change the wireless fee allocation percentage during the September 2018 E911 Board meeting. The fee allocation to the counties was changed from 76 percent to 88 percent. This change went into effect January 16, 2019.
Georgia	Yes, increased prepaid 911 charges from \$.75 to \$1.50, reduced the administrative fee retained by vendors from 3% to 1%, and stopped vendors from charging cost recovery to local governments. The changes were made by legislation in 2018 with an effective date of January 1, 2019.
Illinois	Public Act 100-0020 amended the Emergency Telephone Safety Act and the Prepaid Wireless 9-1-1 Surcharge Act in July 2017 and effective January 1, 2018. [Illinois increased the uniform monthly surcharge from \$.87 to \$1.50 effective January 1, 2018 for wireline, VoIP, and wireless connections. <sup>26</sup> ]
Nebraska	[Nebraska reproduces a decision of the Nebraska Public Service Commission adopting an interim mechanism for allocating PSAP funding under the E911 Act. Pursuant to such interim mechanism, the funding authorized for each eligible PSAP (except for Douglas County) with respect to the 2018-2019 funding year shall be an amount equal to each such PSAP's funding allocation for the 2017-2018, plus an additional one (1) percent. With respect to Douglas County, the funding authorized shall be an amount equal to such PSAP's 2017-2018 funding allocation, plus an additional fourteen (14) percent, in order to address the greater negative impact of 911-SAM population assumptions affecting the metropolitan area of Douglas County. Pursuant to this interim funding mechanism, the total amount of funding authorized for eligible PSAPs for the 2018-2019 funding year is \$4,935,877.] <sup>27</sup>
Rhode Island	On July 1, 2018, RIGL §39-21.1-14 was renamed “Emergency services and first response surcharge.” Subsection (g) was amended to include the “State’s first responder and emergency services agencies.” In addition, RIGL §39-21.2-2(8) Findings, was revised as follows: “To ensure equitable contributions to the funding 911 of emergencies emergency systems from consumers of prepaid wireless telecommunication services, the collection and payment obligation of charges to support E911 the state's first responder and emergency services should be imposed upon the consumer's retail purchase of the prepaid wireless telecommunication service and should be in the form of a single, statewide charge that is

<sup>24</sup> Alabama Response at 4.

<sup>25</sup> Georgia Response at 4.

<sup>26</sup> See Illinois Response at 4-6 for a summary of amendments.

<sup>27</sup> See Nebraska Response at 4-7.

	collected once at the time of purchase directly from the consumer, remitted to the state, and distributed to E911 authorities pursuant to state law.
South Dakota	SB98 was passed which removed the sunset clause to maintain the \$1.25 per line. Had this not passed, the surcharge would have been lowered to \$.75 per line.

14. The Bureau asked states to describe the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911 fees, specifically whether 911/E911 funds are collected by the state (or equivalent jurisdiction), by local jurisdictions, or by a combination of the two. As described in Table 6 below, 26 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they collect all 911 fees on a statewide basis, with the collected funds administered by the state. Four states reported that 911 fee collection occurs exclusively at the local level, although in some cases such local collection is authorized by state statute.<sup>28</sup> Eighteen states reported using a hybrid approach to 911 fee collection, in which state and local governing bodies share authority over fee collection from customers. For example, Colorado reported that “[s]urcharge funds derived from landlines, contract wireless, and VoIP lines are remitted directly to local 911 Authorities by the carriers. Prepaid surcharge fees are assessed at point-of-sale on the purchase of wireless minutes and remitted to the Colorado Department of Revenue. Those funds are distributed to local governments using a formula based on wireless call volume as a percentage of total wireless calls received in the state.”<sup>29</sup>

**Table 6 – Authority to Collect 911/E911 Fees**

Type of Collection	Number of States/Jurisdictions	States/Jurisdictions
State	30	Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Guam, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, U.S. Virgin Islands, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming
Local	4	Alaska, Mississippi, Missouri, New York
Hybrid	18	Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, West Virginia

<sup>28</sup> See, e.g., Missouri Response at 4; New York Response at 5.

<sup>29</sup> Colorado Response at 4.

#### **D. Description of State Authority that Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**

15. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions identify the entity that has authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 purposes. As detailed in Table 7 below, 14 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that only a state entity has authority to approve expenditure of 911 fees. Twelve states indicated that only local entities have authority to approve expenditures. Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia indicated that authority is shared between state and local authorities.<sup>30</sup>

16. The Bureau also sought information on whether states have established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected funds may be used. As indicated in Table 7, states that responded ‘no’ to this question typically cede control of how 911 funds are spent to local jurisdictions. Forty-five states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they have a mechanism mandating how 911 fees may be spent, whereas four states indicated they have no such mechanism.

**Table 7 – State Authority for Approval of 911 Fee Expenditures**

State	State, Local, or Combined Authority to Approve Expenditures			State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can be Used
	State	Local	Both	
AK	No	Yes	No	No
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AZ	Yes	No	No	Yes
CA	Yes	No	No	Yes
CO	No	Yes	No	Yes
CT	Yes	[No Response]	No	Yes
DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
GA	No	Yes	No	Yes
HI	Yes	No	No	Yes
IA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

<sup>30</sup> With respect to the District of Columbia, the District reported that under D.C. Official Code § 34-1802(c), “expenditures of fees collected and deposited in the 9-1-1 Fund are subject to the approval of the D.C. Council upon request of the Mayor as part of the annual budget submission. Expenditures of 9-1-1 Funds approved by the D.C. Council are then subject to authorization by Congress in an appropriations act pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 34-1802(a).” The District also reported that “for purposes of this report, we have also classified the District at the same level as a state, since it provides 911 services for the entire jurisdiction.” District of Columbia Response at 5.

ID	No	Yes	No	No
IL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LA	No	Yes	No	Yes
MA	Yes	No	No	Yes
MD	Yes	No	No	Yes
ME	Yes	No	No	Yes
MI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MN	Yes	No	No	Yes
MO	No	Yes	No	No
MS	No	Yes	No	No
MT	[No Response]	Yes	No	[No Response]
NC	Yes	No	No	Yes
ND	No	Yes	No	Yes
NE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NH	Yes	No	No	Yes
NJ	Yes	No	No	Yes
NM	Yes	No	No	Yes
NV	[No Response]	Yes	No	Yes
NY	No	Yes	No	Yes
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OR	Yes	No	No	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
RI	Yes	No	No	Yes
SC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VT	Yes	No	No	Yes
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WI	No	No	No	Yes
WV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

WY	No	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>				
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guam	Yes	[No Response]	No	Yes
NMI	[No Response]	[No Response]	No	[No Response]
PR	Yes	No	No	Yes
USVI	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>Totals</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>49</b>

#### E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees

17. The Bureau asked responding states to provide a statement identifying with specificity “all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.” Fifty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this question.

18. The Bureau also requested that states identify whether their 911 fee collections were authorized to be used for specific expenditure categories, including (1) operating costs for customer premises equipment (CPE), computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment and building and facilities; (2) personnel costs (telecommunicator salaries and training); (3) administrative costs associated with program administration and travel expenses; and (4) dispatch costs, including reimbursements to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch services and lease, purchase, and maintenance of radio dispatch networks. Cumulative responses are provided in Table 8, and individual state responses are provided in Table 9.

**Table 8 – Summary of State Responses Regarding Allowable Use of Fees**

<b>Allowable Uses</b>		<b>Total States</b>
Operating Costs	CPE	51
	CAD	41
	Buildings and Facilities	30
Personnel	Salaries	36
	Training	47
Administrative	Programs	46
	Travel	46

Dispatch	Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch	18
	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	27

**Table 9 – Allowed Uses of Collected Fees**

	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
State	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CPE (hardware and software)	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CAD (hardware and software)	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Building and Facilities	Salaries	Training	Program Administration	Travel Expenses	Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks
AK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
AZ	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
CA	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
CO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
FL	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
GA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
HI	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
IA	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ID	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
IL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IN	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
KS	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MD	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
ME	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
MI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

MN	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NC	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
ND	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NJ	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
NM	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NV	Yes	Yes	[No Response]	Yes	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
NY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
OK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
RI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
SC	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TX	Yes	[Yes] <sup>31</sup>	[Yes]	[Yes]	[Yes]	Yes	Yes	[Yes]	[Yes]
UT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
VA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VT	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WI	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
WV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
WY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>									
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Gua m	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes

<sup>31</sup> “[Yes]” denotes that Texas responded both “Yes” and “No” to a given line item. Texas explains: “‘Yes’ and ‘No’ answers to a given line item reflect different uses of 9-1-1 fees; different local laws; different interpretations and applications of state law regarding the use of wireless/prepaid wireless 9-1-1 fees; and different interpretations as to the classification of a cost (e.g., operating cost as opposed to an administrative cost).” Texas Response at 16 note 28.

NMI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
PR	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
US VI	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

19. The Bureau requested information on grants that each state or jurisdiction paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant. Twenty-one states reported that they paid for grants through the use of collected 911 fees.<sup>32</sup> Table 10 provides states' descriptions of their grant programs.

**Table 10 – State Grants or Grant Programs**

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
AK	[No Response]
AL	A total of \$848,341.31 was granted to 11 individual districts based on the demonstration of need for purchase of hosted CPE services, backup power systems, GIS data management systems and map- based computer aided dispatch systems. These grant funds were made available from the state office's administrative one percent.
AR	NA
AZ	The NG9-1-1 Data Improvement Project (NDIP) is designed to assist the 9-1-1 Systems across the state migrate their Geographic Information System (GIS) data sets to a database structure (schema) congruent with the coming Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) systems.
CA	NA
CO	NA
CT	Capital expense grants for funded municipalities and regional emergency communications centers.
DE	[No Response]
FL	Collected funds were used to fund the State Grant Program for counties in Florida to maintain and upgrade their E911 equipment as well as to conduct NG911 system upgrades. Funds were also used to support a Rural County Grant Program to specifically assist rural counties in maintaining their E911 systems. The E911 Board approved 50 grants under the Rural County Grant Program that totaled \$1,909,546. The E911 Board also approved 23 grants that totaled \$4,451,211 under the State Grant Program.
GA	Georgia did not apply for nor receive any state or federal grants for 911/E911 and did not offer any grants for 911/E911.
HI	NA
IA	The State did not have any external grants available during this time frame. The State also offered local jurisdictions GIS grants for the purpose of NG911 GIS data creation, remediation, and maintenance. The total available to counties was \$12,000 per PSAP.

<sup>32</sup> Nevada and the Northern Mariana Islands did not respond to this question. The Northern Mariana Islands noted that it currently does not receive fees for 911 services and that "annual appropriations by state and local municipalities fund 911 operations." Northern Mariana Islands Report at 9.



ID	Pursuant to Idaho Code §31-4803, a county must get voter approval to institute an emergency communications fee in an amount no greater than one dollar (\$1.00) per month per “telephone line”. The Act has been amended in recent years to include assessing the fee on both wireless and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service and now uses the term “access line” to indicate that all technology that is able to provide dial tone to access 9-1-1 is mandated to collect the fee. In 2008, the Idaho Legislature promulgated the implementation of an Enhanced Emergency Communications Grant Fee that was signed into law by the Governor and became Idaho Code §31-4819. This additional fee can be imposed by the boards of commissioners of Idaho counties in the amount of \$0.25 per month per access line to be contributed to the Enhanced Emergency Communications Grant Fund. The funds are distributed via a grant process governed by the IPSCC. Forty Idaho counties have begun assessing the enhanced fee.
IL	During calendar year 2018 the State made \$2,095,637 in grants to local 9-1-1 authorities to assist with PSAP consolidations and Next Generation 911 expenses.
IN	[No Response]
KS	The Council has used the grant funds, which are derived from the 1.20% fee placed on prepaid wireless sales, to fund projects that are of statewide benefit, rather than making individual PSAP grants. These projects to date are the statewide GIS Enhancement Project, Statewide digital orthoimagery, consulting Services for NG911, planning and implementation, and statewide NG911 program management. Council operating expenses are also paid from the state grant fund. The grant funds are also utilized to pay nonrecurring costs for the statewide ESINet and call handling system and for recurring costs for the ESINet.
KY	This information is outlined in the 2018 Annual Report (Appendix B: Master Grant Awards Ledger, Page 47, Attached with submission)
LA	[No Response]
MA	The State 911 Department has developed and administers grant programs to assist PSAPs and regional emergency communication centers, or RECCs, in providing enhanced 911 service and to foster the development of regional PSAPs, regional secondary PSAPs, and RECCs. M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(i) requires that the State 911 Department fund the following grant programs: the PSAP and Regional Emergency Communications Center Training Grant (“Training Grant”); the PSAP and Regional Emergency Communication Center Support Grant (“Support Grant”); the Regional PSAP and Regional Emergency Communication Center Incentive Grant (“Incentive Grant”); the Wireless State Police PSAP Grant; and the Regional and Regional Secondary PSAP and Regional Emergency Communications Center Development Grant (“Development Grant”). See MG.L. Chapter 6A, Sections 18B(i)(1)-(5). The statute also permits the State 911 Department to introduce new grants associated with providing enhanced 911 service in the Commonwealth. See MG.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(f). As permitted by the statute, in 2011, the State 911 Department introduced a new grant, the Emergency Medical Dispatch (“EMD”) Grant. The statute provides that the State 911 Commission shall approve all formulas, percentages, guidelines, or other mechanisms used to distribute these grants. See M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(a). The eligibility requirements, purpose, use of funding, including categories of use of funds, application process, grant review and selection process, and grant reimbursement process for each of these grants are set forth in the Grant Guidelines that are approved by the State 911 Commission. These Grant Guidelines are available on the State 911 Department website at <a href="http://www.mass.gov/e911">www.mass.gov/e911</a> .
MD	9-1-1 Trust Fund monies are distributed for enhancements to county 9-1-1 service as outlined in question E-1. <sup>33</sup>
ME	Although money was obligated for the consolidation of dispatch only centers into PSAPs, no money was actually paid out in 2018.
MI	NA

<sup>33</sup> See Maryland Response at 6.

MN	According to Minn. Stat. §403.113, a portion of the fee collected must be used to fund implementation, operation, maintenance, enhancement, and expansion of enhanced 911 service, including acquisition of necessary equipment and the costs of the commissioner to administer the program. After payment of costs of the commissioner to administer the program, money collected shall be distributed as follows: (1) one-half of the amount equally to all qualified counties, and after October 1, 1997, to all qualified counties, existing ten public safety answering points operated by the Minnesota State Patrol, and each governmental entity operating the individual public safety answering points serving the Metropolitan Airports Commission, the Red Lake Indian Reservation, and the University of Minnesota Police Department; and (2) the remaining one-half to qualified counties and cities with existing 911 systems based on each county's or city's percentage of the total population of qualified counties and cities. The population of a qualified city with an existing system must be deducted from its county's population when calculating the county's share under this clause if the city seeks direct distribution of its share. (b) A county's share under subdivision 1 must be shared pro rata between the county and existing city systems in the county. A county or city or other governmental entity as described in paragraph (a), clause (1), shall deposit money received under this subdivision in an interest-bearing fund or account separate from the governmental entity's general fund and may use money in the fund or account only for the purposes specified in subdivision 3. (c) A county or city or other governmental entity as described in paragraph (a), clause (1), is not qualified to share in the distribution of money for enhanced 911 service if it has not implemented enhanced 911 service before December 31, 1998. (d) For the purposes of this subdivision, "existing city system" means a city 911 system that provides at least basic 911 service and that was implemented on or before April 1, 1993.
MO	[No Response]
MS	NA
MT	No grants were awarded during this reporting period.
NC	ECATS - PSAP Call Data Collection Interpretive Services Contract Orthography Image 18 Orthography Image 19 Graham Relocation-Equipment Refresh Hyde, Dare, Tyrell: Dare Regional Emergency Richmond Co Consolidation of primary and 3 secondary's Forsyth PRI PSAP Relocation: Phase 1 Lincoln PSAP Contraction Project Martin PSAP & Regional Backup Facility Mitchell Backup Center Initiative Pasquotank Backup PSAP Implementation Rowan Backup PSAP Implementation Shelby Regional Initiative Washington Backup PSAP Implementation Catawba Backup PSAP Implementation Perquimans Backup PSAP Implementation Rocky Mt Backup Plan Implementation Franklin Radio Upgrade/Expansion Robeson Backup Plan Implementation Wilson Viper Radio Upgrade Iredell Enhancement/Regional Backup
ND	[No Response]
NE	There were none in 2018 they had been phased out in 2017.
NH	[No Response]
NJ	[No Response]
NM	Grants to local governments pay for E-911 equipment and maintenance, generators, dispatch consoles, recorders, dispatch software, GIS equipment and training, 911 training, 911 and data networks, and network termination equipment, such as firewalls, routers and switches.
NV	[No Response]
NY	NA
OH	*See attached for county responses to the above questions 2 and 2a. <sup>34</sup>

<sup>34</sup> See Ohio Response, attached spreadsheet "Final 2019 FCC Nat. 9-1-1 Survey Responses Reporting Year 2018 (003).xlsx," available at <https://www.fcc.gov/eleventh-annual-fee-report-state-filings-0>.

OK	The State 9-1-1 Management Authority FY2019 budget included an allocation for a State 9-1-1 grant program. The allocation was \$3,350,000. However, over the course of this budget year the Authority did not launch the grant program. This allocation has been rolled over to FY2019 where \$5,250,000 has been allocated for a State Grant program. The State Grant program is a duty of the 9-1-1 Management Authority that is outlined in State Statute §63-2864.2.
OR	[No Response]
PA	Per 35 Pa.C.S. § 5306.1 (d) (2) Fifteen (15) percent of the revenue collected is set aside to be used to establish, enhance, operate or maintain statewide interconnectivity of 9-1-1 systems. Any of these statewide interconnectivity funds distributed to a PSAP will be through an annual grant process. In 2018, PEMA awarded Pennsylvania PSAPs \$39 million for 85 projects related to PSAP consolidations, projects that establish or maintain broadband connectivity between PSAPs, NG9-1-1 GIS projects, and projects that allow PSAPs to share 911 system resources.
RI	None
SC	[No Response]
SD	NA
TN	[No Response]
TX	The CSEC 9-1-1 Program provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to 21 RPCs for the specific purpose of providing 9-1-1 service in each RPC's region. CSEC provides grants of appropriated surcharge revenues to six Regional Poison Control Center host hospitals to partially fund the state Poison Control Program. (Equalization surcharge revenue is also appropriated to the Department of State Health Services and TTUHSC to fund county and regional emergency medical services and trauma care, and a telemedicine medical services pilot program, respectively.)
UT	* During the calendar year 2018, a portion of the 911/E911 fees collected and distributed to the Utah Communications Authority (the state) were granted to Six PSAPs, specifically to maintain their CPE hardware and software.
VA	The PSAP Grant Program is a multi-million dollar grant program administered by the Virginia 9-1-1 Services Board. The purpose of the program is to financially assist Virginia primary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) with the purchase of equipment and services that support the continuity and enhancement of wireless E9-1-1. Funding is made available through the Code of Virginia and administered by the Board.
VT	NA
WA	The state provides operational funding grants to smaller counties that do not collect sufficient local 911 excise tax revenues to support a basic level 911 program. These grants provide for salaries, equipment, maintenance, and training funds.
WI	NA
WV	One million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) per year is awarded by the PSCWV as grants for the construction subsidization of cell towers in unserved areas, pursuant to W.Va. Code §24-6-6b.
WY	Unknown
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>	
AS	[No Response]
DC	NA
Guam	None
NMI	[No Response]
PR	None.
USVI	During the annual period ended December 31, 2018, there were no grants paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees.

## F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

20. In order to provide an overview of the sources of 911 fees, the Bureau directed respondents to describe the amount of fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services and to distinguish between state and local fees for each service type (wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and other services). Table 11 provides an overview of the number of states and localities that levy a fee on each service type.

**Table 11 – Summary of State and Local Authorities That Levy 911 Fees**

Service Type	State	Local	Both	No Response or No Fee
Wireline	27	15	4	10
Wireless	34	8	4	10
Prepaid	32	5	4	15
VoIP	28	12	3	13
Other	8	3	1	44

21. Table 12 details the average fee by type of service.<sup>35</sup> Based on responding states' information, the average wireline 911 fee is \$1.05 per line per month; the average wireless 911 fee is \$0.99 per line per month; the average prepaid wireless percentage of retail transaction 911 fee is 2.28%; the average prepaid wireless flat 911 fee per transaction is \$0.88; and the average VoIP service 911 fee is \$0.99 per line per month.<sup>36</sup> Thirteen jurisdictions reported that they have no prepaid service 911 fee, and 18 jurisdictions reported they had no VoIP service 911 fee.

**Table 12 – 911 Fee Highlights by Service Type**

Service Type	Average 911 Fee	State with Lowest Associated Fee (per line per month)	State with Highest Associated Fee (per line per month)	States/Jurisdictions with No Associated Service Fee
Wireline – Flat Fee	\$1.05	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia - \$3.01	Arkansas, California, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, Northern Mariana Islands, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin

<sup>35</sup> See Appendix C for a detailed description of fees and charges that each reporting state and jurisdiction levied on wireline, wireless, prepaid, VoIP, and other services during calendar year 2018.

<sup>36</sup> Some jurisdictions reported imposing a percentage fee on wireline and wireless service rates. See, e.g., Vermont Response at 10 (reporting that it imposed “2% customer telecommunications charges” on wireline, wireless, and prepaid wireless services).

Wireless – Flat Fee	\$0.99	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia - \$3.34	California, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Northern Mariana Islands, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
Prepaid - Percentage of Retail Transaction	2.28%	Ohio - 0.05%	West Virginia - 6.00%	Alaska, Hawaii, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Northern Mariana Islands, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
Prepaid - Flat Fee per Retail Transaction	\$0.88	Nevada - \$0.25	U.S. Virgin Islands - \$2.00	
VoIP – Flat Fee	\$0.99	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia -- \$3.01	Alaska, California, Guam, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, Northern Mariana Islands, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin

22. The Bureau asked states to report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges by service type, including wireline, wireless, VoIP, prepaid wireless, and any other service-based fees. Table 13 shows that, in total, states and other jurisdictions reported collecting approximately \$2,675,270,976 in 911 fees or related charges for calendar year 2018. Table 13 also includes the Bureau's estimate of annual fee collections on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Although 911 fees are typically collected on a per customer basis rather than a per capita basis, the per capita estimate nonetheless provides a useful benchmark for comparing fee collections and expenditures across states and other jurisdictions.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> See *supra* note 18 (noting that per-capita calculations are based on 2010 census data and, where those data are unavailable, World Bank data).

**Table 13 – Total Amount Collected in 911 Fees by Service Type**

State	Wireline	Wireless	Prepaid	VoIP	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percentage of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita <sup>38</sup>
AK	\$3,848,382.00	\$10,352,289.60	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	[No Response]	\$14,200,671.60	[No Value]	[No Value]
AL	\$19,569,072.12	\$74,242,395.37	\$22,645,138.51	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$116,456,606.00	\$106,276,266.00	110%	\$23.83
AR	Unknown	\$15,919,923.72	\$5,605,388.93	*N/A – Included in Wireless	\$2,000,000.00	Unknown	[No Response]	[No Value]	[No Value]
AZ	\$14,406,263.64	Combined with wireline and VoIP	\$1,594,388.64	Combined with wireline and wireless	\$126,752.64	\$16,127,404.92	\$17,364,937.00	93%	\$2.25
CA	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	NA	[No Response]	\$108,206,000.00	[No Value]	[No Value]
CO	\$17,430,424.00	\$48,798,711.00	\$2,484,586.00	\$5,530,083.00	NA	\$74,243,804.00	[Unknown]	[No Value]	\$13.04
CT	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$2,462,263.00	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$27,359,069.92	\$29,770,052.54	92%	\$7.66
DE	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$9,151,657.13	\$9,400,000.00	97%	\$9.46
FL	\$10,028,885.00	\$65,626,832.00	\$24,040,353.00	\$18,251,397.00	None	\$117,947,467.00	\$222,556,957.00	53%	\$5.54
GA	Unknown	Unknown	\$21,473,447.69	Unknown	[No Response]	\$21,473,447.69	Unknown	[No Value]	\$2.04
HI	\$600,900.00	\$9,500,000.00	None	\$1,500,000.00	None	\$11,600,900.00	Unknown	[No Value]	\$8.17
IA	\$9,980,018.00	\$27,146,110.19	\$2,222,994.57	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$39,349,122.76	\$152,707,692.38	26%	\$12.47
ID	\$20,172,007.00	Idaho combines wireline, wireless, and VoIP	\$1,603,555.20	Idaho combines wireline, wireless, and VoIP	\$2,598,306.90	\$24,172,149.03	Unknown at aggregated State Level	[No Value]	\$13.78
IL	\$20,131,873.00	\$140,352,636.00	\$9,447,329.00	\$34,828,543.00	\$117,644.00; \$152,975,255 for Chicago (Service Type Breakdown Not Available)	\$357,853,280.00	\$327,457,172.00	109%	\$28.08

<sup>38</sup> *Id.*

IN	\$10,661,202.09	\$53,048,240.19	\$15,653,352.59	\$9,543,644.55	[No Response]	\$88,906,439.42	\$194,787,842.05	46%	\$13.29
KS	Included in wireless amount	\$21,555,710.54	\$1,806,243.44	Included in wireless amount	Included in wireless amount	\$23,361,953.98	\$105,737,626.00	22%	\$8.02
KY	[No Response]	\$20,589,315.34	\$9,093,764.09	[No Response]	\$27,184,627.48	\$56,867,706.91	\$116,658,319.64	49%	\$12.73
LA	\$18,800,212.00	\$40,798,617.00	\$11,770,471.00	VoIP is included in OTHER	\$17,352,151.00	\$92,275,591.00	\$89,897,893.74	103%	\$19.80
MA	\$10,256,540.78	\$64,308,437.80	\$8,675,006.92	\$22,271,950.69	[No Response]	\$105,511,936.19	\$38,645,635.00	273%	\$15.29
MD	\$19,187,912.00	\$29,579,421.00	\$6,857,454.20	NA	\$255,567.61	\$55,880,354.81	\$115,533,085.96	48%	\$9.25
ME	\$1,613,932.10	\$4,548,354.11	\$1,197,824.38	\$1,173,768.80	[No Response]	\$8,533,879.39	\$6,830,314.11	125%	\$6.38
MI	\$22,068,369.77	Included in Wireline	\$16,856,224.89	Included in Wireline	NA	\$38,924,594.66	\$265,304,540.83	15%	\$3.89
MN	\$19,292,405.51	\$48,971,671.38	-	\$2,556,705.07	-	\$70,820,781.96	\$9,499,055.98	746%	\$13
MO	None/Unknown	None/Unknown	None/Unknown	None/Unknown	None/Unknown	None/Unknown	Unknown	[No Value]	[No Value]
MS	\$29,759,156.39	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$29,759,156.39	\$64,819,628.69	46%	996%
MT	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$13,000,000.00	\$13,000,000.00	NA	[No Value]	\$12.24
NC	\$11,464,244.00	\$50,003,087.00	\$13,965,069.00	\$12,847,382.00	[No Response]	\$88,279,782.00	\$126,224,104.00	70%	\$8.50
ND	\$13,746,965.00	Included in Wireline	\$926,387.00	Included in Wireline	[No Response]	\$14,672,353.24	\$18,500,000.00	79%	\$19.30
NE	\$5,138,753.39	\$7,345,255.33	\$1,057,980.82	Cannot provide as it is collected with the landline surcharge at the local authority level.	[No Response]	\$13,541,989.54	Unknown	[No Value]	\$7.02
NH	\$2,058,308.71	\$9,025,243.75	\$1,663,499.94	\$2,796,439.95	[No Response]	\$15,543,492.35	\$13,840,223.97	112%	\$11.46
NJ	Not Available	Not Available	NA	Not Available	NA	\$122,905,000.00	Unknown	[No Value]	\$13.80
NM	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	None	\$11,228,627.48	\$8,561,378.39	131%	\$5.36
NV	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	\$1,122,186.78	\$7,562,104	15%	\$0.37
NY	NA	[No Response]	[No Response]	Included in wireline.	[No Response]	NA	\$1,104,060,030.00	[No Value]	[No Value]
OH	\$593,691.33	\$25,689,296.16 (state collection)	None	\$9,834.50	\$7,128,857.23	\$33,421,679.22	\$354,344,576.66	9%	\$2.86
OK	\$10,580,553.00	\$34,132,321.00	Included in Wireless	Included in Wireless	None	\$44,712,874.00	\$90,500,000.00	49%	\$11.34

OR	\$8,450,000.00	\$30,000,000.00	\$4,500,000.00	\$2,300,000.00	Less than 1%	\$45,550,841.00	\$146,170,610.59	31%	\$10.87
PA	\$45,999,749.00	\$184,576,768.00	\$30,252,996.00	\$53,565,789.00	\$1,821,402.00	\$316,216,704.00	\$348,920,207.00	91%	\$24.69
RI	\$3,371,366.00	\$11,592,466.00	\$720,721.00	Included in Wireless	None	\$15,684,553.00	\$5,186,447.00	302%	\$14.83
SC	[No Response]	\$23,189,664.98	\$8,084,561.95	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$31,274,226.93	[No Response]	[No Value]	\$6.15
SD	\$3,625,084.00	\$8,337,692.00	\$1,223,251.00	\$120,836.00	[No Response]	\$13,306,863.00	\$27,481,502.00	48%	\$15.08
TN	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	\$113,898,014.00	[No Value]	[No Value]
TX	\$61,990,769.00	\$133,143,396.00	\$5,253,643.00	(Included in Wireline)	\$19,777,193.00	\$220,165,001.00	\$283,736,341.25	78%	\$7.67
UT	\$8,178,967.00	\$19,651,404.00	\$1,432,510.00	[Included in Wireline and Wireless]	NA	\$29,262,881.00	\$65,000,000.00	45%	\$9.26
VA	[No Response]	\$60,974,471.93	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$60,974,471.93	Unknown	[No Value]	\$7.16
VT	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	\$4,831,183.00	[No Value]	[No Value]
WA	11165016.14	64409528.46	11834047.17	12514417.23	None	\$99,923,008.00	\$150,000,000.00	67%	\$13.26
WI	Unknown	None	None	None	None	Unknown	Unknown	[No Value]	[No Value]
WV	\$22,579,576.00	\$37,375,419.00	\$22,184.00	\$3,028,467.00	\$681,051.00	\$63,686,697.00	\$73,631,161.00	86%	\$35.27
WY	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	[Unknown]	[No Value]	[No Value]
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>									
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Value]	[No Value]
DC	\$1,588,426.60	\$6,192,987.61	\$535,191.48	\$2,286,630.88	\$1,229,372.58	\$11,832,609.15	\$47,708,266.55	25%	\$16.84
Guam	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	NA	NA	\$2,183,715.71	\$1,490,964.00	[No Value]	[No Value]
NMI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Value]	[No Value]
PR	\$4,216,275.14	\$12,975,066.05	\$1,689,468.00	\$1,323,307.27	None	\$20,204,116.46	\$13,864,255.12	146%	632%
USVI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$3,966,163.00	[No Value]	[No Value]
<b>Total Estimated Fees Collected</b>							<b>\$2,675,270,976</b>		
<b>Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911</b>							<b>\$5,005,132,222</b>		
<b>Total Estimated Fees as a Percentage of Total Estimated Cost</b>							<b>53.5%</b>		
<b>Average State Amount Collected Per Capita</b>							<b>\$10.80</b>		
<b>National Amount Collected Per Capita</b>							<b>\$8.18</b>		



23. States were asked whether any 911/E911 fees were combined with any federal, state, or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services. Of the 55 responding jurisdictions listed in Table 14 below, 23 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported combining collected fees with other funds or grants to support 911 services and 26 states, Guam, and Puerto Rico report they did not.

**Table 14 – States Reporting Whether 911 Fees Are Combined with Federal, State or Local Funds or Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations**

<b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>
AK		X	[No Response]
AL	X		Some local emergency communication districts receive a variety of funding from county/municipal appropriations, federal/state grants, dispatch fees, various service contracts, and donations. The total amount of funding that was combined to 911/E911 fees was \$17,065,908.11 for the fiscal period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018. This information is based on self-reported funding data provided by the local districts; only 81 of the 87 reported.
AR		X	[No Response]
AZ		X	NA
CA		X	NA
CO	X		911 surcharge funds are combined with local funds regularly across the state to fund the PSAP operations. 911 surcharge funds are generally not sufficient to fully fund PSAP capital and operational costs, and the difference is made up by city and county governments.
CT		X	[No Response]
DE		X	NA
FL	X		For the annual period ending Dec. 31, 2018, the 911 fees collected provided approximately 43 percent of operating expenses for 911 operations, with local county general budget appropriations providing the remaining 57 percent of funding to support 911 operations. Based on the data submitted by the counties during our annual survey for county fiscal year ending September 2018, Florida counties spent \$115,809,445 of local funds along with 911 fees revenues to support 911 operations in their counties.
GA	X		The State of Georgia, through the Department of Revenue, distributes prepaid wireless 911 fees to local governments and all other 911 fees are distributed directly to the local governments from the service suppliers. Most local governments have to supplement the operation of their PSAPs because the locally and state collected 911 fees do not cover their operations.
HI		X	[No Response]

IA	X		See the answer to question 3 and 5 for more the answer to this question <sup>39</sup>
ID		X	No fees combined at the State level. 40 counties participate in the state grant and have received money in this manner from the state to augment for equipment and upgrades. Unknown how many PSAPs also augment funds from their county general fund base on poor responses to the survey sent out.
IL		X	[No Response]
IN	X		On average, the 911 fee pays for 40% of operating costs at the local level. Local government relies upon other sources of funding to make up the difference. Those funds come from one or more of the following: property taxes, local option income tax, county adjusted gross income tax, casino funds, other.
KS	X		Local general fund monies are used extensively to fund E911 in Kansas. These funds are derived from property taxes and account for approximately 74% of total funding.
KY	X		Essentially, the costs for providing 911 services are paid at the local level. 911 fees collected by the state on wireless phones are distributed to local governments in regular quarterly payments (and grants) to help pay for daily operational costs and capital purchases. State 911 fees are combined at the local level with local general fund appropriations and local 911 fees to support 911 services. No other state funds are appropriated for 'local' 911 services. (State general funds help pay for 911 services provided by the Kentucky State Police.)
LA		X	[No Response]
MA		X	[No Response]
MD	X		County (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) general funds were used to offset difference between 9-1-1 operational costs and 9-1-1 Additional Fee support.
ME		X	[No Response]
MI	X		In addition to the State and Local funds reported above: County Millages: \$38,396,100.65 Local/County General Funds: \$92,274,641.06 Other Receipts: \$22,950,460.06 (grants, tower rentals, contracts for service, etc.)
MN	X		In 2018, we were awarded \$575,000 in federal funding through the 2017 State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) grant. These funds were used for training and exercises mostly for 9-1-1 dispatchers. Types of training used with this funding included radio training, conference expenses, and dispatcher training.
MO			[No Response]
MS	X		Local budgets must supplement funds received from wireline fees collected to cover operation costs.
MT		X	[No Response]
NC	X		E911 funds were combined with general fund allocations from each of the 115 Primary PSAPs and 12 Secondary PSAPs to pay for expenses not allowed by NC General Statutes to provide for E911 services. Examples of expenses not allowed from collected 911 fees are telecommunicator salaries, facility maintenance, and radio network infrastructure.

<sup>39</sup> See Iowa Response at 9-10 for responses to questions E3 and E5.

ND	X		Prepaid wireless revenue collected by the Office of State Tax Commissioner are combined with a percentage of the fee revenue collected locally to cover expenses associated with the state's transition to NG9-1-1.
NE	X		Local general fund dollars to support 911. The NEPSC would have no way of knowing how much the total dollar amount each local jurisdiction was turning over to their local PSAP for the cost of supporting 911.
NH		X	[No Response]
NJ		X	[No Response]
NM		X	[No Response]
NV	X		Carson City: General Fund  Douglas County: 911 Emergency Services must augment the 911 surcharge fund as the amount collected from the 911 surcharge does not cover the cost of the service.  Lyon County: General Fund  Nye County: General Fund
NY		X	[No Response]
OH	X		*Other funding at the local level comes from general funds and other local, non 9-1-1 specific funding sources. *See attached data for individual county responses.
OK		X	[No Response]
OR	X		The 60% of the Emergency Communications Account that is distributed out to local 9-1-1 Jurisdictions is on average only about 30% of the operating cost of a PSAP. The remaining 70% of expenditures are paid by local resources such as local general funds, contract fees, and dispatch fees. These other sources may be paid by local cities/counties or Public Safety agencies that work with the Primary PSAP.
PA	X		Any 911 related expenses not covered by 911 fees are covered by the general fund or other revenue sources of the respective county or city.
RI		X	NA
SC	X		Local Jurisdictions collect landline 911 fees and combine those fees with the wireless 911 funds distributed by our office to support local 911/E911/NG911 services.
SD	X		At the state level, the answer to this question is no. The 911 dollars were not combined with any other funding at the state level. However, at the local level (county/municipality) they supplement their 911 surcharge funds with additional funding from these sources: local general funds, Office of Homeland Security grant funds, State 911 Surcharge interest, State Grants, Other Intergovernmental Revenue, Charges for Goods/Services, Emergency Management Performance Grant, other Federal Grants, PSAP city/county host subsidy.
TN		X	[No Response]

TX	X		Dallas \$27M Aransas Pass \$281K general \$37K Crime Prevention Board Garland \$2M Longview \$2.2M to support PSAP— dispatcher/telecommunicators salaries, CAD, periphery systems. Several cities cited general city revenue but did not give amounts—including Portland, Lancaster, Wylie, Highland Park.
UT		X	[No Response]
VA		X	NA
VT		X	NA
WA	X		All local jurisdictions contribute additional local funds to augment State and County E911 excise taxes in covering the costs of 911 statewide. On average statewide, it is estimated that 30% of the actual cost of providing Washington State approved 911 activities comes from these local sources. In many cases, this comes from local government general use funds, individual agency user fees, and a 1/10 of 1% sales tax for this purpose. In addition, Washington State Patrol operates 4 Primary and 4 Secondary PSAPs with the majority of funding coming from their general departmental budget. In 2018, the 911 program also received an additional \$1.58 million from the State General Fund to assist with transition costs to the new NG911 ESInet.
WI		X	NA
WV		X	[No Response]
WY		X	NA
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>			
AS			[No Response]
DC	X		Local Funds – \$34,338,153.22 Grants - \$1,385,627.32
Guam		X	[No Response]
NMI			
PR		X	NA
VI	X		Appropriated general budget in the amount of \$2,008,363.64 for salaries and fringe benefits.
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>28</b>	

24. Lastly, the Bureau requested that states provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in the state or jurisdiction. As described in Table 15 below, 12 states, as well as Guam and Puerto Rico, reported that state 911 fees were the sole source of revenue funding 911 services; six states indicated that 50 to 90% of funding came from state 911 fees; five states reported that 50 to 90% of funding came from local fees; one state reported that the source of fees was split evenly between state and local jurisdictions' 911 fee collection; and two states reported that local fees were the sole source of funding. Eleven states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that state and local General Fund revenues accounted for 50 to 90% of 911 funding. The Northern Mariana Islands reported that 100% of funding toward the cost to support 911 came from the Commonwealth's General Fund.<sup>40</sup> Five states reported not knowing the proportional contributions.

<sup>40</sup> See Northern Mariana Islands Report at 12.

**Table 15 – State Estimates of Proportional Contributions from Each Funding Source**

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
AK	None	100%	None	None	None	None
AL	84.98%	None	None	3.42%	0.02%	None
AR	38%	12%*	None	46%	None	4%
AZ	100%	None	None	None	None	None
CA	100%	[None] <sup>41</sup>	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
CO	[Unknown]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	No Response
CT	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
DE	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
FL	39%	None	None	57%	[None]	4%
GA	Unknown	Unknown	None	Unknown	Unknown	None
HI	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
IA	23%	None	None	32%	None	None
ID	90%	Unknown	None	Unknown	None	10%
IL	79%	0/0%	None	21%	None	None
IN	40%	Not permitted	None	60%	None	None
KS	26%	None	None	74%	None	None
KY	22%	27%	None	46%	2%	4%
LA	12.75% (Collected by the State Department of Revenue then dispersed to each parish by population)	87%	None	None	None	None
MA	100%	None	None	None	None	None
MD	12.11%	36.34%	None	63.66%	None	None
ME	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
MI	11%	31%	None	35%	None	None
MN	100%	None	None	PSAPs may receive general funds from	Less than 1%	None

<sup>41</sup> In this table, [None] in brackets denotes that the Bureau can infer with reasonable certainty that no funds came from a particular funding source, even though the state or jurisdiction left the cell blank, because other cells in the same row total 100%. By contrast, [No Response] in brackets denotes that the state or jurisdiction left the cell blank, and the Bureau does not have sufficient information to infer [None]. For example, [No Response] may appear when the other cells in the same row do not total 100%.

				the county in which they operate in addition to the monthly 9-1-1 fee distribution allocated by the legislature.		
MO	None	Unknown	None	Unknown	Unknown	None
MS	None	Local budget and fees collected must cover costs. \$64,819,628.69	None	None	None	None
MT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NC	45%	[None]	[None]	52%	[None]	3%
ND	5%	72%	None	23%	None	None
NE	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
NH	100%	None	None	None	None	None
NJ	Unknown	None	None	Unknown	None	None
NM	100%	None	None	None	None	None
NV	[None]	Varies by jurisdiction	[None]	Varies by jurisdiction	[No Response]	[No Response]
NY	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
OH	26%	44%	17%	72%	5%	3%
OK	100%	100%	None	Unknown	None	Unknown
OR	30%	70%	None	None	None	None
PA	87.5%	[None]	[None]	12.5%	[None]	[None]
RI	[None]	[None]	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]
SC	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
SD	49%	None	None	51%	1%	None
TN	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
TX	76%	24%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
UT	40%	40%	60%	60%	NA	10-30%
VA	50%	50%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
VT	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
WA	18%	50%	1%	31%	[None]	[None]
WI	None	15%	None	85%	None	None
WV	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
WY	Varies by jurisdiction	Varies by jurisdiction	Varies by jurisdiction	Varies by jurisdiction	Varies by jurisdiction	Varies by jurisdiction
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						

AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	[None]	25%	72%	[None]	3%	[None]
Guam	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
NMI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
PR	100%	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]	[None]
USVI	49%	[None]	51%	[None]	[None]	[None]

#### **G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses**

25. Under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act, the Commission is required to obtain information “detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and *including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.*”<sup>42</sup> Therefore, the Bureau requested that states and territories identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purpose other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, such as funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state’s General Fund.

26. As in previous reports, we have identified diversion or transfers of 911/E911 funds and categorized them as to whether the funds were directed to other public safety uses or to non-public safety uses such as state General Fund accounts. With respect to funds devoted to other public safety uses, we have generally determined that funds used to support public safety radio systems, including maintenance, upgrades, and new system acquisitions, are not 911-related within the meaning of the NET 911 Act and therefore constitute a diversion of 911 funds. However, as in past reports, several states have documented expenses associated with integrating public safety dispatch and 911 systems (e.g., purchase of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and dispatch operations) and asserted that these should be categorized as 911-related expenses. We have previously found that where sufficient documentation is provided, the expenditure of 911 funds to support integration of dispatch and 911 call taking systems may be categorized as 911-related, and we follow this approach in this report.

27. Five reporting states diverted or transferred fees in calendar year 2018. As described in Table 16 below, Rhode Island self-identified in its response to the questionnaire that it used collected funds, at least in part, for non-911 related purposes. Nevada, New Jersey, New York, and West Virginia did not self-identify as diverting funds, but the Bureau has determined based on review of the information provided that these states in fact diverted funds for non-911 related purposes within the meaning of the NET 911 Act.<sup>43</sup> The jurisdictions listed in Table 16 diverted an aggregate amount of \$187,085,044.92, or approximately 7.0% of all 911/E911 funds reported to have been collected by all responding states and jurisdictions in 2018.

<sup>42</sup> NET 911 Act at §6(f)(2) (emphasis added).

<sup>43</sup> As discussed below, the Bureau does not find that Nevada diverted fees at the state level in CY 2018. However, the Bureau concludes that one local jurisdiction, Carson City, diverted 911 fees in 2018.

**Table 16 – Total Funds Diverted or Otherwise Transferred from 911 Uses**

State/Territory	Total Funds Collected	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Percentage Diverted	Type of Transfer
	(Year End 2018)			
States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
Rhode Island	\$15,684,553.00	\$10,498,106.00	66.9%	Public Safety Related and Unrelated
States/Jurisdictions Identified by Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
Nevada	\$1,122,186.78	[Unknown]	[Unknown]	Public Safety Related
New Jersey	\$122,905,000.00	\$92,083,000.00	74.9%	Public Safety Related and Unrelated
New York	\$200,249,254.00	\$83,503,938.92	41.7%	Public Safety Related and Unrelated
West Virginia	\$63,686,697.00	\$1,000,000.00	1.57%	Public Safety Related and Unrelated
Total	\$403,647,690.78	\$187,085,044.92	46.35%	
Percent Diverted From Total Funds Collected by All States				
Total	\$2,675,270,975.95	7.0%		

**1. States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds.**

28. *Rhode Island.* Rhode Island reports that out of a total of \$15,684,553 in 911/E911 fees collected in CY 2018, it diverted \$10,498,106,<sup>44</sup> or 66.9% of the total. Specifically, Rhode Island states that 90% of the 911/E911 fees it collected were deposited into the state General Fund and that the remaining 10% was submitted to the State Information Technology Investment Fund pursuant to state law.<sup>45</sup> Rhode Island reports that it financed the E-911 program via the General Fund.<sup>46</sup> The FY 2018 budget for the E-911 program was \$5,186,447, with personnel costs accounting for \$3,959,607 and operating expenses accounting for \$1,226,840.<sup>47</sup> The remaining funds collected were “distributed via the state General Fund” and were “used to fund various programs within the State.”<sup>48</sup> The Bureau was unable to determine whether the diverted funds were allocated to uses related to public safety.

<sup>44</sup> Rhode Island Response at 10.

<sup>45</sup> Letter from Lt. Michael J. McGlynn, Rhode Island State Police, Acting Director, Rhode Island E-911, to Lisa M. Fowlkes, Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (June 28, 2019) at 3 (Rhode Island Supplemental Letter Response).

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*

<sup>48</sup> *Id.* at 3, 4.



## **2. States/Jurisdictions Identified by the Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds.**

29. *New Jersey.* New Jersey reports that it did not divert or transfer any collected funds.<sup>49</sup> However, in response to Question E.1., New Jersey states that in accordance with New Jersey statute (P.L.2004, c.48), all fees collected were “deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs.”<sup>50</sup> Specifically, New Jersey reports that the \$122,905,000 it collected in 911 fees in calendar year 2018 was deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of programs within the Departments of Law and Public Safety, Military and Veterans’ Affairs, and Treasury.<sup>51</sup> Of these programs, expenditures for the “Statewide 9-1-1 Emergency Telecommunication System” and “Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services” indicate a nexus to 911.<sup>52</sup> Other programs to which 911 funds were allocated, such as the operating budget of the Division of State Police, National Guard Support Services, and state Urban Search and Rescue, do not indicate a nexus to 911. As in previous years, the state also has not supplied any documentation that would support a conclusion that these latter programs are 911-related.<sup>53</sup> New Jersey reports that appropriations for the Statewide 9-1-1 Emergency Telecommunication System and Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services totaled \$30,822,000.<sup>54</sup> The Bureau concludes that these expenses were 911-related and that New Jersey diverted the remaining portion of the \$122,905,000 it collected in 911/E911 fees, or a total of \$92,083,000.

30. *Nevada.* Nevada’s response this year indicates that at least one local jurisdiction diverted a portion of its 911/E911 funds in 2018. In its response for last year’s Tenth Report, Nevada reported that in 2017, the state legislature “added an allowance to increase the E911 fee to help pay for body cameras for officers.”<sup>55</sup> Nevada also reported that the state legislature increased the maximum surcharge to allow “purchase and maintenance of portable event recording devices and vehicular recording devices.”<sup>56</sup> The Bureau found in the Tenth Report that the expenditure of 911/E911 fees on police body cameras and vehicular recording devices constituted diversion of 911/E911 fees for non-911 public safety uses.<sup>57</sup> In this year’s filing covering 2018, Nevada has not submitted any information indicating that the state has prohibited or discontinued the use of 911 fees for body cameras and vehicular recording devices. In addition, Carson City, Nevada indicates in its response for 2018 that it used a portion of the 911 fees it collected for law enforcement body cameras, although it does not specify the amount of the expenditure.<sup>58</sup> Accordingly, we find that at least one local jurisdiction in Nevada has diverted a portion of the 911/E911 fees it collected in 2018 to a non-911 public safety use.

---

<sup>49</sup> New Jersey Response at 11.

<sup>50</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>51</sup> *Id.* at 6, 9.

<sup>52</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*

<sup>55</sup> See Tenth Report at 45 (quoting Churchill County, Nevada 2017 Response at 4).

<sup>56</sup> *Id.* at 45-46 (quoting Washoe County, Nevada 2017 Response at 4).

<sup>57</sup> *Id.* at 46.

<sup>58</sup> See Carson City, Nevada Response at 6. Although Carson City indicates that it spent 911 funds on law enforcement body cameras, it does not state how much it spent for this purpose. See *id.*

31. *West Virginia.* Although West Virginia reports that it did not divert funds, the Bureau finds that the state diverted \$1,000,000 of the \$37,375,419 in “wireless enhanced 911 fees” it collected in 2018. West Virginia reports that it apportioned \$3,987,795 of the 911 fees it collected to the following dedicated accounts: \$1,000,000 to the Tower Assistance Fund to subsidize construction of towers, which the state describes as ensuring enhanced 911 wireless coverage; \$1,868,770.95 to the state’s Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management for construction, maintenance, and upgrades associated with the state’s Interoperable Radio Project; and \$1,119,024.52 to the West Virginia State Police for equipment upgrades to improve and integrate their communication efforts with those of enhanced 911 systems.<sup>59</sup>

32. Consistent with our finding in last year’s Tenth Report, we do not agree with West Virginia that the construction of commercial cellular towers to expand cellular coverage is “911-related” within the meaning of the NET 911 Act.<sup>60</sup> Although expanding cellular coverage enhances the public’s ability to call 911, the NET 911 Act focuses on funding the elements of the 911 call-handling system that are operated and paid for by state and local 911 authorities. Accordingly, we conclude that West Virginia diverted the \$1,000,000 in 911 fees that it allocated for commercial network construction. With respect to the reported expenditure of 911 funds on public safety radio systems and upgrades, we do not consider purchase or upgrade of public safety radio equipment to be 911-related because radio networks used by first responders are technically and operationally distinct from the 911 call-handling system. However, certain radio expenditures may be considered 911-related if the state shows a clear nexus to the 911 system, e.g., expenditures to integrate radio dispatch functions with 911 call-handling. In West Virginia’s case, as in previous years, the state has not provided documentation of such a nexus to enable us to conclude that its radio expenditures are 911-related. We need not reach this issue, however, given our finding above with respect to use of 911 fees for cellular tower construction. Therefore, we do not include these expenditures in our calculation of the amount diverted, but we encourage West Virginia to provide additional information on these programs in next year’s submission if the state continues to fund them with 911 fees.

33. *New York.* The Bureau has found New York to be a diverter of 911 fees every year since the 2009 Report to Congress, and in 2018 New York continued to operate under the state law framework that provides for such diversion. Section 186-f of the New York State Consolidated Tax Law requires the collection of a Public Safety Communications Surcharge consisting of a monthly \$1.20 fee for each mobile device.<sup>61</sup> State tax records indicate that in fiscal year 2018, New York collected \$200,249,254 through the Public Safety Communications Surcharge.<sup>62</sup> New York did not include any information about expenditures in its filing for this year’s report.

34. New York contends that the Public Safety Communications Surcharge is outside the scope of the NET 911 Act because the surcharge “support[s] a wider set of purposes” than 911/E911.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> West Virginia Response at 6, 11-12, 13, 15.

<sup>60</sup> See Tenth Report at 47.

<sup>61</sup> N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 2 (McKinney 2017).

<sup>62</sup> See New York State, Department of Taxation and Finance, Table 6: Article 9 – Corporation and Utilities Tax Collections, Fiscal Years 1989-2018, [https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/2017-18\\_Collections/Table%206.pdf](https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/2017-18_Collections/Table%206.pdf).

<sup>63</sup> New York Response at 4. New York reports only funding collected by counties and the City of New York pursuant to the Enhanced Emergency Telephone System Surcharge under New York County Law Article 6, §§ 300-308. *Id.* Further, New York asserts that the state was unable to determine the total amount collected through such fees because “[c]ounties are not required to report collection totals to the State.” See *id.* at 9, 10; see also New York County Law § 303.

We do not agree that a fee or charge must be exclusively designated for 911 or E911 purposes in order to constitute a fee or charge “for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services” under Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act.<sup>64</sup> The purposes for which the Public Safety Communications Surcharge is designated clearly include the support or implementation of 911 or E911 services. We also note that Section 186-f authorizes a surcharge on “wireless communications service,” which the statute defines to mean “all commercial mobile services, as that term is defined in section 332(d) of title 47 of the United States Code, as amended from time to time, . . . which offer real time, two-way voice or data service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network *or otherwise provides access to emergency communications services.*”<sup>65</sup> Accordingly, Section 186-f expressly links the Public Safety Communications Surcharge to services that provide access to emergency communications services, or 911. We conclude that the Public Safety Communications Surcharge is a fee or charge “for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services” under Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act.

35. Having found that New York’s surcharge falls within the scope of the NET 911 Act, we also find that the state has diverted funds as defined by the Act. Under the statute, 41.7% of the fees collected through the surcharge are allocated to the state’s General Fund, while the remaining 58.3% of funds collected are distributed to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account.<sup>66</sup> We conclude that the portion allocated to the state’s General Fund constitutes a diversion of 911 fees. Based on the reported collection of \$200,249,254 raised via the surcharge in 2018, and in the absence of any showing in New York’s filing as to how funds allocated to the General Fund were spent, we find that 41.7% of the total, or \$83,503,938.92, was diverted.

36. We also note that New York has not provided information relating to expenditure of the 58.3% of funds allocated to the Statewide Public Safety Communications Account, and thus has not established that these expenditures were 911-related. The statute identifies a variety of public-safety related programs that may receive state grants funded by the New York surcharge. For example, the statute allocates \$25.5 million from surcharge funds to the New York State Police,<sup>67</sup> and sets aside additional funds for grants to counties in support of interoperable communications for first responders.<sup>68</sup> An additional \$10 million is set aside for grants to counties for costs related to PSAP operations.<sup>69</sup> While the \$10 million in funding for PSAP operations is clearly 911-related, New York’s filing did not provide any documentation of grants awarded in 2018 that would allow us to make a similar finding with respect to its other public safety grant programs.<sup>70</sup> Nevertheless, because we lack information regarding the

---

<sup>64</sup> NET 911 Act § 6(f)(1); *see also* 47 U.S.C. § 615a-1(f)(1).

<sup>65</sup> N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 1(d) (McKinney 2017) (emphasis added).

<sup>66</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 5(a), (b).

<sup>67</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 6(a).

<sup>68</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 6(c).

<sup>69</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 6(g).

<sup>70</sup> In a press release, New York announced the award of \$45 million via the 2018 Statewide Interoperable Communications Grant (SICG) program to 57 counties and New York City to “enable[] local governments to expand their emergency response capabilities to enhance public safety operations.” *See* Press Release, New York Governor Andrew M. Cuomo, Governor Cuomo Announces \$45 Million in State Grant Funding to Improve Emergency Communications Statewide (Oct. 11, 2018), <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-45-million-state-grant-funding-improve-emergency-communications>. New York also awarded more than \$32 million in grants through the 2018 Statewide Interoperable Communications Targeted Grant (SICTG) program to “improve emergency communications” in seven counties. *See* Press Release, New York Governor Andrew M. Cuomo, Governor Cuomo Announces More Than \$32 Million in State Grant Funding to Improve Emergency Communications in Seven Counties (Nov. 28, 2018), <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-more-32-million-state-grant-funding-improve-emergency-communications>. This information

(continued....)

specific expenditure of public safety grant funds, we do not reach the issue of whether these funds were diverted and do not include them in our calculation of the amount diverted by New York.

### 3. Other Jurisdictions.

37. *Virginia.* As in previous years, Virginia reports that it diverted a portion of the 911 funds collected in calendar year 2018 for purposes outside the scope of its established state funding mechanisms.<sup>71</sup> However, on review of the expenditures at issue, the Bureau again concludes that Virginia has demonstrated a sufficient nexus with 911 to support a finding that these expenditures were 911-related. Virginia reports that in 2018 it diverted a portion of its wireless E-911 funding to the Virginia State Police (VSP) for costs incurred for answering wireless 911 telephone calls, as well as to support sheriff's 911 dispatchers.<sup>72</sup> According to the Virginia response, these funds totaled approximately \$4.4 million.<sup>73</sup> Virginia notes that while its 911 funding mechanism does not specifically provide for funds to be diverted to the VSP and sheriffs' offices, the diverted funds were used to support 911-related activities.<sup>74</sup> Similar to our finding in the Tenth Report, we agree that Virginia's 2018 expenditure to support 911 dispatch by these agencies is 911-related, and we therefore do not identify Virginia as having diverted funds.<sup>75</sup>

38. *Montana.* Montana reports that it did not divert 911 fees in 2018.<sup>76</sup> In its submission for 2017, Montana indicated that the state transferred \$2.0 million to its general fund and used those funds for a purpose unrelated to 911 or E-911.<sup>77</sup> The Bureau accordingly concluded in the Tenth Report that Montana had diverted funds in 2017 for non-911 or E-911 use.<sup>78</sup> In its response for 2018 and in correspondence with FCC Commissioner Michael O'Rielly, Montana notes that the state legislature has repealed the statute that allowed general fund transfers in 2017 and affirms that the state did not transfer any 911 or E911 fees to the general fund in 2018.<sup>79</sup> Accordingly, the Bureau does not find Montana to have diverted 911 fees in 2018.

39. *U.S. Virgin Islands.* Based on the explanation provided in the 2019 filing from the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Bureau finds that the U.S. Virgin Islands did not divert 911 fees in either 2017 or 2018. The U.S. Virgin Island's filings for CY 2017 and 2018 show that the U.S. Virgin Islands levies a \$2.00 monthly "Emergency Service" surcharge on all landline, wireless, and VoIP customers in the U.S. Virgin Islands pursuant to Title 33, Subtitle 3, Chapter 111, Section 29 (a-d), Subsection 3099 (a-f) of the

(Continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_

does not provide sufficient detail for us to determine whether or to what extent any of these grant expenditures may have been 911-related.

<sup>71</sup> See Virginia Response at 12.

<sup>72</sup> *Id.*

<sup>73</sup> *Id.*

<sup>74</sup> *Id.*

<sup>75</sup> See Tenth Report at 43.

<sup>76</sup> See Montana Response at 12.

<sup>77</sup> See Tenth Report at 43-44 (citing Montana 2017 Response at 12).

<sup>78</sup> *Id.*

<sup>79</sup> See Montana Response at 12; Letter from Steve Bullock, Governor, to Commissioner Michael O'Rielly, Federal Communications Commission, (Sept. 24, 2019) at 1, available at <https://www.fcc.gov/elevanth-annual-fee-report-state-filings-0>.

Virgin Islands Code, as amended in January 2017. The surcharge is identified on customer bills as an Emergency Service charge and does not reference 911.

40. According to the U.S. Virgin Islands, the 2017 statutory amendment provides that all monies collected from the Emergency Service surcharge are deposited in an Emergency Service Fund (ESF) and that ESF funds are allocated: (1) 40% to the Virgin Islands Territorial Emergency Management Agency (VITEMA); (2) 30% to the Department of Health – Emergency Medical Services Unit for supplies, training and personnel; and (3) 30% to the Virgin Islands Fire Services.<sup>80</sup> The 40% of ESF funds is obligated and allocated by statute to VITEMA and is entirely used for 911/E911 support of PSAPs. The other 60% of the surcharge is allocated to non-911 medical and fire services as specified in the statute. These percentages are set by statute and cannot be altered.<sup>81</sup> In addition, by statute, the ESF is separate from all other U.S. Virgin Islands accounts, and ESF funds cannot be commingled with or redirected to the general fund or any other account.<sup>82</sup> As a practical matter, this means that of every \$2.00 fee collected, \$0.80 is obligated for 911/E911 uses. In sum, per the U.S. Virgin Islands statute, the fees collected for 911/E911 uses are entirely severable and traceable to the 911/E911 uses for which they are intended, and the U.S. Virgin Islands is obligated to spend the funds on these 911/E911 uses.

41. In Table 17 below, we compare the number of states reporting fee diversions in this reporting year to past years.

**Table 17 – States/Jurisdictions Identified as Diverting 911/E911 Funds (2009 – 2019)**

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
States	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI
	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY
	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL		
						NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
		AZ	AZ	AZ							
		GA	GA	GA							
	ME		ME	ME							
	OR	OR	OR								
						WA		WA			
							WV	WV	WV	WV	WV
							NH	NH			
	WI	WI									
										NV	NV <sup>83</sup>
						CA					
		DE									

<sup>80</sup> See U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 4.

<sup>81</sup> *Id.*

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*

<sup>83</sup> As noted above, the Bureau did not find that Nevada diverted 911 fees at the state level in CY 2018. However, the Bureau concluded that one local jurisdiction diverted 911 fees in 2018.

		HI									
								IA			
					KS						
	MT									MT	
		NE									
									NM		
	TN										
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						PR		PR			
										USVI	
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>States and Other Jurisdictions That Did Not File a Fee Report</b>											
<b>States Not Filing A Report</b>				LA		LA	LA				
							MO	MO	MO		
			OK						OK		
					AR						
			KS								
									MT		
				NH							
			NJ								
									NY		
				RI							
<b>Other Jurisdictions Not Filing A Report</b>	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI	NMI		
		Guam	Guam		Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam		
	USVI			USVI	USVI	USVI	USVI				
					AS	AS					AS
				DC							
									PR		
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

42. In 2012, Congress passed the Next Generation 911 Advancement Act, Public Law 112-96 (2012 Act), which dedicated \$115 million in FCC spectrum auction proceeds to support future matching grants to eligible states and U.S. territories for the implementation and operation of 911, E911, and NG911 services and applications, migration to IP-enabled emergency networks, and training public safety personnel involved in the 911 emergency response chain. The 2012 Act tasked the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) with administering the grant program.<sup>84</sup> On Aug. 9, 2019, the Departments of Commerce and Transportation announced the award of more than \$109 million in grants to 34 states and two Tribal Nations as part of the 911 Grant Program.<sup>85</sup> As with last year's report, we remind interested

<sup>84</sup> See National Telecommunications and Information Administration, *Next Generation 911*, <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/category/next-generation-911> (last visited Nov. 14, 2019).

<sup>85</sup> See Press Release, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Departments of Commerce and Transportation Announce \$109 Million in

(continued....)

parties that Section 6503 of the 2012 Act requires applicants that receive grants under this program to certify that no portion of any designated 911 charges imposed by the state or other taxing jurisdiction within which the applicant is located is being obligated or expended “for any purpose other than the purposes for which such charges are designated or presented.”

#### **H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees**

43. To understand the degree to which states and other jurisdictions track the collection and use of 911 fees, the Bureau requested that respondents provide information about whether they had established any oversight or auditing mechanisms in connection with the collection or expenditure of 911 fees. As indicated in Table 18 below, 44 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they have established an oversight mechanism; six states stated they have no oversight mechanism.

44. The Bureau also asked whether each state or other jurisdiction has the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider’s number of subscribers. Thirty-three states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they have authority to conduct audits of service providers. Sixteen states and the District of Columbia reported that they do not. Of the 36 jurisdictions indicating they have authority to audit service providers, nine states and Puerto Rico indicated that they had undertaken “auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions” in connection with such authority; 14 states indicated no such actions were taken during the period under review; and eleven states, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond, did not provide a relevant response, or did not know.

**Table 18. Description of Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911 Fees**

(Continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_  
Grants to Modernize 911 Services for States and Tribal Nations (Aug. 9, 2019), <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/press-release/2019/departments-commerce-and-transportation-announce-109-million-grants-modernize>.

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?	Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2018 <sup>86</sup>
AK	No	No	NA
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>87</sup>
AR	No	No	No
AZ	Yes	Yes	Yes
CA	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
CO	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
CT	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
DE	Yes	Yes	Yes
FL	Yes	No	NA
GA	No	No	Did Not Specify
HI	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
IA	Yes	No	No
ID	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
IL	Yes	Yes	None
IN	Yes	Yes	None
KS	Yes	Yes	None

<sup>86</sup> Question H.2a of the FCC's questionnaire asks respondents to "provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2018" if they provided an affirmative response to Question H.2 (i.e., "Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? Check One"). Respondents were further instructed in question H.2a to write "None" if no audits were conducted. Many respondents left the field blank or provided non-responsive information (i.e., they quoted or described statutory text that either was irrelevant to the call of the question to provide a description of actions undertaken or did not on its face demonstrate that an audit in fact was conducted in 2018). Accordingly, in this Table 18, "Did Not Specify" denotes that either (1) the jurisdiction responded to question H2 but did not write "None" in response to Question H.2a as instructed (i.e., the field for H.2a was left blank) or (2) the jurisdiction responded to Question H.2a by supplying text that did not specify whether an audit of carriers was in fact conducted in 2018. The use of "NA" in this Table 18 denotes that either (1) the jurisdiction did not respond to question H.2a and answered "no" in response to both questions H1 and H2 (i.e., the non-existence of a mechanism or authority to audit leads to a reasonable inference that the issue of whether carriers were audited in 2018 is not applicable) or (2) the jurisdiction wrote "NA" in response to question H.2a. "Unknown" is noted where jurisdictions stated "unknown" or otherwise indicated that it lacked information necessary to form a response.

<sup>87</sup> The performance of an audit in 2018 is inferred from Alabama's report that "[u]nder § 11-98-13, Code of Alabama 1975, on a biennial basis, if not more frequently, the 911 Board shall retain an independent, third-party auditor for the purposes of receiving, maintaining, and verifying the accuracy of . . . the collection of the 911 services charge required to be collected." See Alabama Response at 15.



KY	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>88</sup>
LA	Yes	Yes	None
MA	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
MD	Yes	Yes	None
ME	Yes	Yes	None
MI	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
MN	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify <sup>89</sup>
MO	NA	Yes	Did Not Specify
MS	No	Yes	Did Not Specify
MT	Yes	Yes	NA
NC	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
ND	Yes	Yes	None
NE	Yes	Yes	None
NH	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
NJ	No	No	Did Not Specify
NM	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
NV	Yes <sup>90</sup>	[No Response]	[No Response]
NY	Yes	Yes	None
OH	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
OK	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify <sup>91</sup>
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes
RI	Yes	Yes	Yes
SC	Yes	Yes	None
SD	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify

<sup>88</sup> Kentucky responded, “KRS 65.7629(13) directs the Kentucky 911 Services Board to retain an independent certified public accountant to audit the books of the board, CMRS providers and PSAPs to verify the accuracy of collection and disbursement of the CMRS service charge, on a biannual basis.” See Kentucky Response at 14.

<sup>89</sup> Minnesota does not have a mechanism to audit wireless, prepaid, or VoIP 911/E911 fees charged to subscribers. Minnesota audits only wireline carriers, which covers only about 15% of Minnesota subscribers. This audit is limited to comparing cost-recovery payments made to carriers for maintaining ALI records, which are made on a per-record basis, to the number of records in the ALI database for which carriers remit the 911 monthly surcharge. If there is a disparity of over 5%, then Minnesota requires the carriers to “true up.” See Minnesota Response at 16.

<sup>90</sup> Carson City and Douglas County responded yes; Lyon County and Nye County responded no; and Churchill County, Lander County, Las Vegas Paiute Reservation, the City of Las Vegas & Unincorporated Clark County (LVMPD), and Storey County provided no response.

<sup>91</sup> Oklahoma states that it “oversees the Wireless fee collection. Reports, audits and standards are listed in State Statute §63-2864.4 that gives the 9-1-1 Management Authority the duty to ensure funds are spent in compliance with Statute. Also §63-2868 outlines what an agency can use the wireless fee for. Local 9-1-1 oversight is mandated by statute (63-2814) to oversee Wireline 9-1-1 fee collection.” See Oklahoma Response at 5.

TN	Yes	No	Yes <sup>92</sup>
TX	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
UT	Yes	Yes	None
VA	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
VT	Yes	Yes	Yes
WA	Yes	Yes	None
WI	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
WV	Yes	Yes	None
WY	Yes	No	None
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	Yes	No	NA
Guam	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify <sup>93</sup>
NMI	[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
PR	Yes	Yes	Yes
USVI	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
<b>Yes Totals</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>No Totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>

## I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

45. The Bureau requested that states and other jurisdictions specify whether they classify NG911 expenditures as within the scope of permissible expenditures for 911 or E911 purposes, and whether they expended funds on NG911 in calendar year 2018. With respect to classifying NG911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures, 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam indicated that their 911 funding mechanism allows for distribution of 911 funds for the implementation of NG911. Alaska, Missouri, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that their funding mechanism does not allow for the use of 911 funds for NG911 implementation.<sup>94</sup> With respect to expending funds on NG911 programs, 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico indicated that they used 911 funds for NG911 programs in 2018. Table 19 shows the general categories of NG911 expenditures that respondents reported supporting with 911/E911 funds, although most respondents did not specify NG911 expenditures by category.

<sup>92</sup> Although Tennessee did not respond to question H2a, the performance of an audit in 2018 is inferred from its response to question H1a. Tennessee states that “ECDs [Emergency Communications Districts] are subject to annual audits to assure compliance with the Revenue Standards and generally accepted auditing standards. Audits are submitted to the Comptroller of the Treasury.” See Tennessee Response at 13.

<sup>93</sup> Guam reports that its Public Utilities Commission has authority to audit providers’ collection of the 911 surcharge from their subscribers, but “this information is not made available to the Guam Fire Department.” See Guam Response at 12.

<sup>94</sup> Alaska Response at 15; Missouri Response at 15, Puerto Rico Response at 16, U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 16.

**Table 19 – Number of States Indicating One or More Areas of NG911 Investment**

<b>Area of Expenditure</b>	<b>States/Other Jurisdictions</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>General Project or Not Specified</b>	Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming	50
<b>Planning or Consulting Services</b>	Nebraska, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin	4
<b>ESInet Construction</b>	Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Washington	4
<b>NG911 Core Services</b>	Arizona, California, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia	11
<b>Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades</b>	Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, U.S. Virgin Islands, Washington	18
<b>GIS</b>	Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Vermont, Virginia	10
<b>NG Security Planning</b>		0
<b>Training</b>	California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Ohio, South Dakota, U.S. Virgin Islands, Vermont, Wisconsin	14

46. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report the amount of funds expended on NG911 programs in the annual period ending December 31, 2018. Table 20 shows the NG911-related expenditures and projects reported by 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.<sup>95</sup> Collectively, these jurisdictions spent \$228,538,053.28 on NG911 programs, or approximately 9% of total 911/E911 fees collected. Six states did not specify the amount spent for NG911 purposes. Fourteen states, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands report no expenditures for NG911-related programs.<sup>96</sup>

**Table 20 – Funds Spent on Next Generation 911 Programs**

<sup>95</sup> We note that in response to Question I.2, six states, Arkansas, Idaho, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Oregon, as well as Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated they did not spend any funds on NG911 programs in 2018, but nevertheless provided a description of NG911-related programs in response to question I.4.

<sup>96</sup> These include Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Wyoming.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
AL	\$7,308,352.21	Alabama completed its wireless carrier aggregation project in December 2014, which was as far as the first iteration of Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN) was able to accomplish with the vendor selected during the first phase of the project. All wireless calls in Alabama were routed through this network for 3+ years. In CY2016, Alabama completed our second RFP process for NG911 core services and transition/ incorporation of our existing network. After evaluating the proposals, the evaluation team made a recommendation to the full Board in July 2016 to enter contract negotiations with an intent to award, which the Board unanimously supported. We successfully negotiated a contract that was executed and then favorably reviewed by the Contract Review Permanent Legislative Oversight Committee in March 2017. Transition of the existing network began in 2017 and was completed in February 2018. During CY2018, every PSAP (with the exception of one that was under construction) was in some stage of equipment and circuit installation and 15 PSAPs were migrated onto the ESInet.
AZ	\$3,829,669.59	Fourteen PSAPs deployed a NG9-1-1 Managed Services solution in 2018 bringing the total number of PSAPs on a NG9-1-1 Managed Services platform to thirty-nine. An additional twenty-six PSAPs in the MR9-1-1 System deployed a NG9-1-1 solution. Five PSAPs are scheduled to deploy a NG9-1-1 Managed Services solution in 2019.
CA	\$5,950,000.00	The State of California has two NG9-1-1 ESInet projects under development. The Regional Integrated Next Generation project in Pasadena and the Northeast ESInet project. Both projects will utilize a NENA i3 compliant solution. In addition each ESInet will include a hosted CPE solution that supports all or some of the PSAPS in the Regional ESInet currently under development.
CT	\$10,577,263.00	Completion of statewide deployment of Text-to-911. Public awareness campaign of Text-to-911 service in Connecticut. Project included: Governor's Press Conference, television and radio announcements, billboards, social media, print materials and cinema advertisements.
DE	\$3,300,000.00	The State of Delaware is currently working on the Power Locate implementation. This project aligns with the NG911 objective. The Power Locate technology is used to add another layer of identifying callers. Supplemental location information is provided based on the telephone number or latitude and longitude of a 9-1-1 request for assistance at the emergency call center
FL	\$9,291,732.00	Locally, counties are working on their GIS database, synchronizing the MSAG and ALI database with their GIS database to prepare for GIS based call routing. This is an ongoing project.
HI	\$5,000,000.00	We have a hosted CPE solution with our ILEC however, we are in the process of procuring a consultant to assist us in developing a State Plan for the transition to NG911. In addition, we have applied for the 911 Grant for the training of our telecommunicators and first responders for our NG911 transition. We are still awaiting the award the 911 Grant.

IA	\$5,319,726.90	During this reporting period PSAPs continued to upgrade to the NENA i3 standard Next Gen. PSAPs upgraded their CPE's and Recorders to SIP capable/enabled. During this reporting period, PSAPs worked with GeoComm to continue the maintenance phase for GIS data that will ultimately be used for NextGen upgrades. HSEMD offered GIS grants to local jurisdictions to help facilitate this effort. As part of the GIS project, HSEMD completed statewide aerial imagery for use at the PSAPs in their mapping tools. During this reporting period, HSEMD continued contractual relationships with CPE vendors to facilitate the rapid roll out of Text to 911 in Iowa. Currently 97 out of 99 counties are capable of receiving text to 911. During this reporting period, Comtech TCS continued work on building out the secondary ESInet. This is a completely redundant ESInet connecting 13 PSAPs with the CLCs. In case of a large outage, those 13 PSAPs could handle the statewide calls. During this time period, we contracted and began the process to provide shared services for CPE, CAD, and recorder to the benefit of the PSAPs During this time period we contracted and began the process to merge the legacy landline network onto the existing ESInet. During this time period, the State continued contractual relationships with the NGCS provider and ESInet provider	
IL	\$167,534.80	A region of 14 9-1-1 authorities joined together calling themselves the Counties of Southern Illinois (CSI) to create a NG9-1-1 system. Seven of the 14 systems were implemented in 2014 and the remaining 7 were implemented in 2015. There are currently 13 9-1-1 authorities that make up CSI, as a result of a consolidation. Geneseo Communications currently provides an ESInet to 4 counties. The State posted an NG911 RFP for an ESInet, NGCS and NOC/SOC in December 2018.	
IN	\$15,000,000.00	The board has continued working with INdigital and AT&T during this reporting period to build out an additional ESInet and the build should be completed in calendar year 2020.	
KS	\$6,520,318.71	Statewide NG911 system implementation continued throughout 2018, with a total of 92 PSAPs currently on the system and an additional 2 planned for mid-2019. All of these PSAPs are (or will be) connected via IP to the AT&T Nationwide ESInet in an AFRI configuration. All of the PSAPs will be migrated to geospatial call routing by the end of 2019. All are currently text enabled. The Solacom Hosted System remains in a legacy state, with two of the initial users of that system having migrated to (or currently in queue to) the statewide system. Plans for migration of that system to NG911 are unknown. The MARC system is currently investing in replacement of legacy selective routers with IP Selective routers and a planned migration to i3 routing is underway. A part of that migration plan will include interconnection with the statewide ESInet.	
KY	\$3,143,378.30	Grant implementation continued for 25 grant awardees totaling \$2,005,588. The grants were awarded for Next Generation 911 technology and critical equipment replacement while adhering to the Kentucky 911 state plan. Next generation technology including host/remote solutions and other critical 911 components such as CAD upgrades, logging recorders and radio consoles.	
LA	[Unknown]	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Project</b>
		Acadia	Currently getting prices to upgrade radio console equipment along with radios and also looking at 9-1-1 equipment upgrade which will be NG-911 ready. Hopefully projects will be started and completed in 2019. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project

	Allen	Working on Text-2-911; mapping system; upgrading computers. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Ascension	We have an ongoing project to implement text to 911. All existing equipment is capable, yet we continue to wait on ATT to implement SIP trunks for our area. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Assumption	Shared Project to update Radio Consoles. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Avoyelles	Shared Project to update Radio Consoles. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Beauregard	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Bienville	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Bossier	Discussions are being completed for future considerations.
	Caddo	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project. Integrated Smart 911 and Rapid SOS enhanced Location service
	Calcasieu	Upgrading Phone System to latest NG911 standards in 2018. NG-911 Compliant Computer Aided Dispatch System purchased in 2017
	Caldwell	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Cameron	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Catahoula	YES, Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Claiborne	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Concordia	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	De Soto	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	East Baton Rouge	Ongoing project to upgrade public safety radio backup system. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	East Carroll	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	East Feliciana	CAD system upgrade/ installed fiber lines. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Evangeline	Texting and MMS lines into the 911 system. Training that is specific to NG-911 for dispatchers. A secondary PSAP for 911 system. Add another position for anticipated increase in call volume due to possible consolidated dispatch.
	Franklin	Viper Equipment installed. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Grant	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project

	Iberia	Procurement of NG-911 capable telephone system in 2019 at a cost of approximately \$350,000.00. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Jackson	Accumulating funds to replace existing 9-1-1 equipment. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Jefferson	Implemented A911 I.P. Network NICE recorders
	Jefferson Davis	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	La Salle	A decision has been made as to the NG911 equipment that best fits our needs. We are now attempting to work out the financial issues. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Lafayette	New cloud based NG-911 Computer Aided Dispatch system and mobile data system for public safety agencies throughout the parish, transition to broadband AVL system for public safety agencies, conversion from 911 stand-alone mapping to ESRI mapping which will allow first responders and Lafayette Consolidated Government agencies to use one mapping data base. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Lafourche	RAPID SOS deployment. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Lincoln	Continued improvement of GIS datasets. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Livingston	Livingston Parish Communications District (LPCD) is currently testing with the Wireless Vendors Text-to-911. As of this report LPCD has trained all communications personnel on the use of Text-to-911. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Madison	Install CopSync, Alert System, Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Morehouse	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Natchitoches	We are finalizing the "standup" of a new Emergency Communications Center that is designed to support the operations of each public safety discipline operating in the Parish. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Orleans	Working with LANENA NG9-1-1 Subcommittee to create standards, governance model, and plan for future ESINet implementation
	Ouachita	CPE Phone Equipment Upgrade completed 01/2019. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Plaquemines	Text to 911 capable
	Pointe Coupee	Current phone system is NG911 compatible. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project

	Rapides	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Red River	Text-to-911 - Ongoing Discussion/Research on hardware/software upgrades from West regarding the implementation of text-2-911. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Richland	Implemented an NG Capable 911 System in 2018. Updated Recorder 2019. Looking to a new CAD system and eventually SIP lines. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Sabine	NEW EQUIPMENT UPGRADE, NG911 COMP MAPPING. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	St. Bernard	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	St. Charles	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	St. Helena	SAME AS TANGIPAHOA PARISH
	St. James	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	St. John the Baptist	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	St. Landry	St. Landry Parish 911 has partnered with St. Landry Parish Sheriff's Office and has configured a new CAD system in order to transition to NG-911. Also, SLP 911 has installed a new SolaCom ANI/ALI system that is NG-911 ready. St. Landry Parish 911 is actively participating with the Louisiana 911 Directors in researching and evaluating current options for establishment of, or buy into an ESI net
	St. Martin	(Install Solacom) NENA NG-911 (i 3) Ready communication system. Upgrade and install mapping software.
	St. Mary	Phone System
	St. Tammany	Completing and moving into a new co-located center with upgraded WEST 9-1-1 Equipment (1st Quarter of 2019) Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
	Tangipahoa	Working with the state APCO/NENA groups to seek the best system for our state for all PSAPs
	Tensas	We are in the process of upgrading. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Terrebonne	Replaced all Circuits with Fiber (except radio circuits). Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
	Union	Applying for a Delta Regional Authority Grant to fund purchasing new 911 Call Answering Equipment. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project



		Vermilion	Still plan to upgrade 911 phone system, mapping system and Cad system to a more NG-911 friendly option. Hope to begin the process in a year or two. Currently looking at equipment options and accumulating funds to pay for the upgrade project. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
		Vernon	Consultation with Motorola to determine equipment capabilities and cost of upgrade. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
		Washington	CPE Replacement in 2019. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
		Webster	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
		West Baton Rouge	Equipment is already NG911 capable CPE and CAD as upgraded LAST year. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
		West Carroll	Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project
		West Feliciana	We are in discussion of upgrading our CAD. Working with APCO/NENA on ESI net project.
MA	\$36,661,465.00	The deployment of the Next Generation 911 system began in Fiscal Year 2017 and concluded in December, 2017. All Massachusetts PSAPs were operating within the Next Generation 911 system for CY 2018. All Massachusetts PSAPs have also implemented and are currently operating Text to 911 and Rapid SOS capabilities.	
MD	\$10,046,499.47	Four counties have been funded and are currently migrating to an ESInet and NGCS provider. The State of Maryland has authored a strategic NG911 plan to aid in the migration. Other jurisdictions are currently evaluating vendors. The state has also contracted for GIS validation services to prepare all jurisdictional data for NG911.	
ME	\$5,197,872.54	The State of Maine has a single, statewide NG911 system that was fully deployed by August 2014 and was in place for all of 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018. The State of Maine is working with the State of New Hampshire to interconnect the two states.	
MI	\$2,676,733.13	In 2018, there were 7 Michigan Counties that went live with a NG911 network. There were also 21 more counties that signed contracts to deploy NG911 in the near future (those projects are currently underway in their deployment process and those that are waiting to begin).	
MN	\$5,536,720.58	The State of Minnesota has worked to build upon the text-to-9-1-1 network that was implemented statewide in 2017. Although 100% of the state is covered by text-to-9-1-1 services, regional text answering PSAPs are being used to answer non-text implemented PSAPs. In 2018, we implemented 12 new text-to-9-1-1 PSAPs. Regarding GIS work, the State of Minnesota has continued to build its statewide geospatial dataset. We have worked in conjunction with statewide GIS entity MnGeo to validate GIS work done by local jurisdictions and have given grants to counties who are far behind and cannot afford the work on their own. The GIS dataset completion has been a main priority for Minnesota in regards to NG9-1-1. For cybersecurity, Minnesota continues to install firewalls at the PSAP that will offer added protection from cyber-attacks. Finally, a network aggregation provider has partially implemented a SIP-based gateway for 9-1-1 traffic.	

MS	[None]	The number of NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period under review was 21	
NC	\$134,223.00	The NC 911 Board approved award of the State ESINet contract to AT&T in June 2017 with actual contract award in August of 2017. The contract provides for a statewide ESINet provided as a managed service. In addition, the contract provides Hosted Call Handling services that are also provisioned as a managed service. The Board will implement a State Operated Network Management Assistance Center (NMAC) to centralize network management, PSAP help desk, cyber-security monitoring and similar services as part of the NG911 project. Work on this phase of the project began in 2018 with the selection and outfitting of the physical space for the NMAC. Budget for NMAC personnel was approved and a new NMAC manager position classification was created. In February of 2018, an RFP for GIS addressing, and routing was posted. Offers were received and evaluated through the end of the year. The State is managing the GIS project concurrently with the ESINet migration to achieve full i3 geo-spatial call routing capability with the conclusion of the NG911 ESINet migration.	
ND	\$1,789,887.00	Development of a statewide GIS database to replace MSAG entries approximately 60% complete.	
NJ	\$175,000.00	Internal staff and consultant services to begin the development of a RFP for the replacement of the State's legacy 9-1-1 network with a state of the art, IP based, Next Generation 9-1-1 network.	
NV	\$152,581.00	Carson City: None yet.  Lyon County: Updated Vesta hosted solution system implemented. The system is text-to-911 capable.	
OH	\$200,000.00	<b>County</b>	<b>Project</b>
		Auglaize	The Butler County 9-1-1 System is currently NG9-1-1 ready and has been since 2013. Expenditure were made for a five-year refresh of certain equipment during 2018.
		Butler	None.
		Carroll	Contracted with GDIT finalizing circuits (ALI) set up at SOCC
		Champaign	Our Center upgraded our 9-1-1 phone system to Motorola's Emergency Callworks. Our next step is to enable the text-to-911 feature as soon as funds are available to do so.
		Clark	Clark County has purchased Motorola Spillman Flex and Motorola Callworks to start NG911.
		Clermont	Install of the Motorola Callworks 9-1-1 Phone system
		Columbiana	None
		Coshocton	Still in the qote [sic] phases.
		Crawford	None.
		Cuyahoga	Text to 9-1-1 integration with Motorola CallWorks
		Darke	None.

	Defiance	We have the system in place but we have not deployed the system for everyday use.
	Delaware	Text to 9-1-1
	Erie	Text to 911 and mass notification. Neither project was completed or approved for 2018
	Fayette	911 Hardware/software & mapping enhancements made during 2018
	Franklin	Text-to-911 implemented in Franklin County – 3 911 designated 911 Hosts: Viper/TCS & Cassidian/Airbus.
	Geauga	Replaced the Sheriff's Office PSAP (Geauga County) Call Handling, mapping, Consoles; upgraded electrical UPS circuits.
	Hamilton	City of Cincinnati participates in NG911 Network. City of Norwood upgraded its' CPE and NG911 Network. Hamilton County contracted with West Safety Services for NG911 Network.
	Harrison	In progress for 2018
	Hocking	NA
	Huron	Currently participating in meetings and studies for Ohio's NG-911 and awaiting implementation at the state level.
	Jackson	Digital telephone switch upgrade and CAD upgrade
	Jefferson	A countywide core and PSAP CPE upgrade were completed in May of 2018. The system was upgraded to the Motorola Callworks platform.
	Knox	New phone software implemented in 2018.
	Lake	Updating Motorola 911 System PSAP [Ohio reports this 2017 data because the county did not respond].
	Lawrence	NA
	Licking	We are currently building a brand new 911 Center in Heath Ohio. The current center will act as a backup to the new center. Anticipated opening is Fall 2019.
	Lorain	NG911 capable equipment is in place at our new location.
	Lucas	Implemented Text-to-911
	Madison	Upgraded VIPER Phone System 05/04/2018 for NG911
	Mahoning	We have four projects underway currently: 1) new countywide Vesta/AT&T NG9-1-1 System 2) new Voice Loggers Countywide, Eventide; 3) new Countywide CAD (Spillman); 4) Purging of 9-1-1 database to "clean up" discrepancies, cell towers, etc.

	Medina	Tritech Central Square NG911 implementation September 2018
	Mercer	*Text to 911 was completed in Mercer County in 2018 and is fully functional
	Miami	Did not complete any new projects, but maintained previous (i.e. text-to-911).
	Monroe	[No Response]
	Montgomery	Four PSAPs upgraded phone systems to a NG compatible level.
	Morgan	Morgan County, Ohio turned on and has been 100% operational with an i3 compliant NG911 system on July 9, 2014 with NO downtime.
	Noble	Increased recording capacity, purchased Airbus Vesta system connected to Frontier Communications hosted system.
	Paulding	NG911 provided by Central Square/ Zuercher Z911, went live on January 8, 2019
	Pickaway	A complete rebuild of the Pickaway County Sheriff Dispatch Center that included NG911 infrastructure. This will ensure that once the ESINET comes online, we will have the technology required to utilize it.
	Pike	Upgraded to vesta 911.
	Portage	Enhanced Software Updates, IP Phone Technologies Updates
	Richland	None
	Sandusky	The county selected a new NG 911 vendor for its new system. The background building of the system took place in the year 2018 and go-live is expected in the 2nd quarter of 2019
	Scioto	None.
	Seneca	MOST EQUIPMENT INSTALLED, BUT NOT SERVICE
	Shelby	NA
	Stark	Upgraded our hardware equipment Added Avaya VSP switches to allow to redundancy
	Summit	The Summit County Office of Information Technology conducted a study to determine points of connectivity from the City of Akron to outside jurisdictions. Currently in the process of determining how each community can connect with at least two redundant points. [Ohio reports this 2017 data because the county did not respond.]

		Union	We've been part of the state NG9-1-1 pilot project for several years. We contracted with GDiT to deploy NG9-1-1 through the state SOCC. Conference calls began November in 2018, and we have a scheduled cut-over date for July 2019.
		Vinton	None
		Washington	NG-911 system is in place and operational. Only phase that hasn't been started would be texting 911.
		Wayne	Finalizing connection between Wayne County and Ashland County
		Wyandot	By fall of 2019, NG 911 should be installed and operational.
OR	NA	Transitional NG9-1-1 is currently in the planning stage.	
PA	[Unknown]	PEMA has released a request for proposals for a statewide ESInet and next generation core services system for call delivery. At the regional level, regional ESInets are in place or in progress across PA with the intent of sharing 911 system resources. Statewide GIS efforts are in progress that include the statewide collection of aerial imagery and a statewide GIS data gap analysis for NG911.	
RI	\$468,453.09	RI E-911 started implementation of Text-to-911 services on our NG911 platform in 2018. The system was successfully deployed in February 2019.	
SC	[No Response]	We have 4 counties that are operating on their own ESInet. South Carolina is laying the groundwork to issue an RFP for a statewide ESInet in the summer of 2019.	
SD	\$4,005,623.00	During calendar year 2018, we operated on the statewide hosted CPE that was deployed in 2017. We continue to compile all of the existing GIS data in the State to create a statewide seamless GIS dataset. At the end of 2018, the statewide dataset was at 94.85% with 29 of 63 counties at or above 98%. In 2019, the focus will be to increase the accuracy of all counties to 98%. 26 out of 28 PSAPs were deployed to the statewide ESInet between May and October of 2018. After discovering major system issues, all PSAPs moved off the ESInet, and all South Dakota PSAPs were again operating on the legacy system by the end of 2018. The State of South Dakota issued a Request For Proposals in January of 2019 for statewide NG9-1-1 services. The RFP was awarded to CenturyLink on 6/21/19.	
TN	\$15,777,517.00	As of December 31, 2018, 103 PSAPs are live on the NG911 network. 14 PSAPs have been rolled back from live status and 10 PSAPs have been tested but were not approved for live traffic. On September 27, 2018, the Tennessee Emergency Communications Board voted to proceed with moving from AT&T's microDATA-based internet protocol selective routing (IPSR) solution to its nationwide ESInet™ with next generation 911 core services (NGCS) solution. This decision includes a transition to the automatic location identification (ALI) platform also supported by the AT&T nationwide solution. As of December 31, 2018, there were 10 PSAPS utilizing call handling as a service (hosted controller).	

TX	\$28,474,393.00	<p>CSEC 9-1-1 Program: No i3 NG911 compliant networks turned up and operational during calendar year 2018. Significant progress made in preparing to implement NG911, such as: * Governance * GIS Data Standards * Development of NG9-1-1 Managed Service offering on the Texas Department of Information Resources Catalog of services. This will allow any governmental agency in the state to purchase NG9-1-1 Managed Services. Availability of this service offering is targeted for Sept.01, 2019. * GIS Data Quality 772 ECDs: The Greater Harris County 9-1-1 Emergency Network is almost complete in their transition of PSAPs from single point of failure legacy 9-1-1 selective router to redundant, IP selective routers connectivity, and is in the process of continuing transition of wireless, VoIP, and legacy wireline transitions to IP system. The Lubbock 9-1-1 District awarded their contract, and has transitioned their PSAP to IP selective routers. As has been announced publicly (<a href="https://about.att.com/story/2018/central_texas_emergency_communications.html">https://about.att.com/story/2018/central_texas_emergency_communications.html</a>) the Capital Area Emergency Communication District executed a contract for AT&amp;T ESInet. The Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network has indicated an intent to award a contract to AT&amp;T ESInet. Municipal ECDs: Longview in early stage discussions with Emergency Callworks to convert to a local ESInet. Plano--SMS implementation is underway. Upgrade of VESTA to VESTA Map Local, including Rapid SOS integration is in planning stages. ESInet project initial discussions are happening. Aransas Pass--Motorola software upgrade of entire 911 system, new interface software and continue to test Text to 911 to make sure the system handles such calls properly.</p>
UT	\$1,500,000.00	* Davis County, Utah Valley and Dixie Area Regional Multi-node were completed in 2018.
VA	\$6,827,311.00	<p>Local Government NG9-1-1 Plans NG9-1-1 migration proposals have been completed for 124 primary and secondary PSAPs served by a primary selective router pair. The purpose of these proposals is to provide information about prerequisite work needed within the PSAP, expected costs, and funding provided by the Board for a NG9-1-1 solution. NG9-1-1 implementation in Virginia should be complete by the end of calendar year 2021. National Capital Region NG9-1-1 Project Award: On August 8, 2017, Fairfax County awarded a NG9-1-1 ESInet and core services contract to AT&amp;T. A contract award summary can be found here. The seven northern Virginia PSAPs included in the award were scheduled for deployment in the 4th quarter of 2018, but that has been delayed until the Fall of 2019. At their January 11, 2018 meeting, the 9-1-1 Services Board recommended that the remaining Virginia PSAPs utilize the Fairfax contract for their NG9-1-1 deployments. Funding for allowable NG9-1-1 migrations costs will be available to these PSAPs beginning July 1, 2018. Transition to Managed IP Network for 9-1-1 Call Delivery: Eleven Virginia PSAPs have transitioned off the Verizon or Century Link selective routers that serve their PSAP and have migrated to a managed IP network solution through a third-party provider. The decision to transition to a managed IP network was a local one.</p>
VT	\$4,831,183.00	<p>The State of Vermont has and continues to allow expenditures under the 911 program for Next Generation 911 services. Vermont's current statewide NG911 system is provided by Consolidated Communications. In March of 2018, the State of Vermont issued a Request for Proposals for the next NG911 system provider in Vermont. The contract was awarded to INdigital. The INdigital solution will be implemented in July 2020 when the contract with Consolidated is complete.</p>

WA	\$7,349,248.00	In 2016, Washington State began a transition to a replacement NG911 ESInet. After building out the network and interconnecting the old 911 network with the new ESInet, the PSAPs began migrating (transitioning) on May 1, 2018. The entire project is anticipated to be completed by December 2019. The state also continued replacement of analog 911 telephone equipment in the PSAPs with NG911 phone systems. A total of 6 primary PSAPs were upgraded during calendar year 2018.
WI	\$66,145.00	Wisconsin issued an ESInet Request for Information in June 2018 to explore options for implementing a statewide ESInet. In addition, Wisconsin issued a NG911 Consultant Request for Proposal in July 2018 to assist in the planning and implementation of a statewide ESInet. Local PSAPs continue to implement "NextGen-capable" equipment to prepare for a local, regional, or statewide ESInet.
WV	\$7,358,115.00	Upgrade CAD Systems, IP Radio and Phone Systems
WY	[Unknown]	According to Title 16, Chapter 9 of the Wyoming State Statutes for the emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign over-sight responsibility to a state-level agency for 9-1-1 services. (16-9-102(a)(iv)).
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>		
DC	\$1,624,172.16	The DC OUC prepared for a migration to a NG9-1-1 Legacy Network Call Routing and NG9-1-1 CAD integrated call handling system. This system will also manage Integrate MSRP Text-to-9-1-1. The deployment includes migration to a backup Text-to-9-1-1 web browser solution, an upgrade to the eCDR collector, and upgrade to NG9-1-1 IP audio recording and screen capture system.
PR	\$106,180.80	None
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$228,538,053.28</b>	

47. **ESInet Deployments.** The Bureau requested that states and other responding jurisdictions provide information on whether they had any Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets) operating during calendar year 2018.<sup>97</sup> The Bureau further requested descriptions of the type and number of ESInets operating within each state or jurisdiction, and the number of PSAPs linked to each ESInet. As detailed in Table 21, 18 states reported having deployed state-wide ESInets, 14 states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and 9 states reported local-level ESInets.<sup>98</sup>

**Table 21 – Type and Number of ESInets Deployed During Period Ending December 31, 2018**

<sup>97</sup> ESInet deployment is an indicator that the state or jurisdiction is transitioning to IP-based routing of 911 calls, but ESInet deployment, by itself, does not mean the state has completed its transition to NG911 service. The deployment of ESInets, while a significant step in the transition to NG911, does not in and of itself constitute full implementation of NG911 functionality. In addition, while the data reported here indicate that significant ESInet deployment has occurred, the data also indicate that the vast majority of PSAPs nationwide continue to operate on legacy networks.

<sup>98</sup> The following states indicated that they have both regional and local ESInets operating within the state: Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Texas, and Virginia.

Type of ESInet	Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInets		States/Jurisdictions Responding YES	Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets
	No	Yes		
<b>Single Statewide ESInet</b>	34	18	Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia	442
<b>Regional ESInet</b>	36	14	Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington	750
<b>Local ESInet</b>	40	9	Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia	96

48. **Text-to-911 Service.** The Bureau requested that respondents specify the number of PSAPs within each state and jurisdiction that had implemented text-to-911 as of the end of calendar year 2018. The Bureau also requested that respondents estimate the number of PSAPs that they anticipated would become text-capable by the end of calendar year 2019. Table 22 sets forth the information provided by 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Collectively, respondents reported 2,093 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2018, and further reported that they anticipated an additional 1,039 PSAPs would become text-capable by the end of 2019. For purposes of comparison, Table 22 also includes data from the FCC's Text-to-911 Registry as of November 15, 2019, which shows the number of PSAPs that the reporting jurisdictions have registered with the FCC as text-capable.<sup>99</sup> While the total number of registered PSAPs is lower than the number of PSAPs that respondents projected would be text-capable at the end of 2019, the Bureau has received data indicating that many additional PSAPs that are not listed in the FCC registry (which is a voluntary registry) are in fact text-capable. Thus, the actual number of text-capable PSAPs as of year-end 2019 may be considerably closer to the projected total in Table 22.

**Table 22 – Text-to-911 Deployments**

<sup>99</sup> The FCC's PSAP Text-to-911 Readiness and Certification Registry is available at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/psap-text-911-readiness-and-certification-form>. FCC rules do not require PSAPs to register with the FCC when they become text-capable; they may notify service providers directly that they are text-capable and certified to accept texts. The FCC has encouraged all text-capable PSAPs to register with the FCC.



<b>State</b>	<b>Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2018</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2019</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2019</b>	<b>Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of November 15, 2019</b>
AK	None		2		2	0
AL	25		60		85	1
AR	14		80		94	14
AZ	26		58		84	28
CA	130		120		250	271
CO	59		12		71	59
CT	108		[No Response]	X	108	107
DE	9		All accepting text messaging now		9	5
FL	75		133		208	52
GA	37		Unknown		37	9
HI	5		NA		5	9
IA	108		2		110	104
ID	36		10		46	37
IL	30		Unknown. This information is not currently tracked.		30	28
IN	91		None		91	87
KS	104		7		111	109
KY	8		30		38	7
LA	20		Unknown		20	8
MA	282		[No Response]	X	282	0
MD	2		24		26	13
ME	24		None		24	25
MI	51		26		77	48
MN	25		35		60	15
MO	Unknown		Unknown		0	50
MS	17		3		20	6
MT	NA		NA		0	32
NC	99		18		117	82
ND	15		None		15	15
NE	28		35		63	26
NH	2		The entire state is currently capable of text to 9-1-1.		2	6

NJ	17		Statewide capability exists and no additional PSAPs planned for text capability until NG9-1-1 deployed.		17	19
NM	None		None		0	0
NV	[Unknown]		1		1	4
NY	33		15		48	30
OH	13		38		51	13
OK	3		21		24	3
OR	27		4		31	22
PA	43		50		93	32
RI	2		2		4	0
SC	12		[No Response]	X	12	21
SD	None		None		0	0
TN	None		7		7	10
TX	344		179		523	409
UT	20		11		31	23
VA	82		37		119	40
VT	6		All PSAPs are currently text capable.		6	6
WA	28		5		33	28
WI	13		Unknown		13	10
WV	15		11		26	5
WY	2		2		4	8
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						
AS	[No Response]	X	[No Response]	X	0	0
DC	1		NA		1	1
Guam	None		1		1	0
NMI	[No Response]	X	[No Response]	X	0	0
PR	2		None		2	1
USVI	None		None		0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,093</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1,039</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3,132</b>	<b>1,938</b>

## J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

49. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions provide information on whether they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2018 and, if so, the amounts of those expenditures. As represented in Table 23, 31 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands

responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs. Eighteen states and the District of Columbia reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2018. The Bureau additionally requested information on the number of PSAPs in each state or jurisdiction that implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs in 2018. Seventeen states and the District of Columbia reported that one or more of their PSAPs either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program. Seven states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that their PSAPs did not implement or participate in cybersecurity programs. Twenty-five states reported that they lacked data or otherwise did not know whether their PSAPs had implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs.

**Table 23 – Annual Cybersecurity Expenditures**

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2018				Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program.
	Yes	No	Reported “Unknown”	Amount	
AK		X		[NA] <sup>100</sup>	None
AL	X			These expenses are part of our NG911 service provider’s project scope, but there is no way to itemize them.	Not reported at the state level
AR		X		[NA]	Unknown
AZ		X		[NA]	None
CA		X		[NA]	Unknown
CO		X		[NA]	65
CT	X			\$230,235.00	Unknown
DE	X			\$96,600.00	9
FL	X			\$448,379.00	77
GA		X		[NA]	Unknown
HI		X		[NA]	Unknown

<sup>100</sup> In this table, [NA] in brackets denotes that an amount is not applicable, whether or not a response was provided, because the respondent answered “no” to the previous question, “During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?”

IA	X			Part of contract with Comtech TCS and ICN, but the cost is not broken out by line item	113
ID	X			Unknown	16
IL		X		[NA]	Unknown. This information is not currently tracked.
IN	X			Exact amount is unknown since it is part of our master contracts	Unknown
KS	X			\$307,252.00	29
KY		X		Three local jurisdictions reported spending local funding on cyber security initiatives.	3
LA	X			Unknown	27
MA	X			[Unknown]	Unknown
MD	X			\$662,408.00	22
ME	X			Unable to determine as it is part of the overall services required of the NG911 System Service Provider contract	24
MI			[No Response]	Data not collected, PFN meets i3 standards and is covered in the cost reported above.	[Unknown]
MN	X			\$193,489.38	3

MO		X		[NA]	Unknown
MS		X		[NA]	None
MT		X		[NA]	NA
NC		X		[NA]	Unknown
ND		X		[NA]	Unknown
NE		X		[NA]	Unknown
NH		X		[NA]	All division employees participate in the State's Department of Information Technology's cyber-security program.
NJ		X		[NA]	None.
NM		X		[NA]	None
NV		X		[NA]	[Unknown]
NY		X		[NA]	NA
OH		X		[NA]	32
OK		X		[NA]	Unknown
OR		X		[NA]	Unknown
PA	X			Amount expended is unknown	Unknown
RI	X			\$39,822.84	2
SC		X		[NA]	[No Response]
SD		X		[NA]	None
TN		X		[NA]	Unknown
TX	X			\$1,232,638.00	3
UT		X		[NA]	None
VA		X		[NA]	Unknown
VT		X		[NA]	Unknown
WA	X			Amount is encompassed in overall contract for NG911 ESInet	65
WI		X		[NA]	Unknown
WV	X			\$201,300.00	18
WY		X		[NA]	Unknown
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>					

AS			[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
DC	X			[Unknown]	1
Guam		X		[NA]	None due to the system being antiquated.
NMI			[No Response]	[No Response]	[No Response]
PR		X		[NA]	None.
USVI		X		[NA]	None
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>\$3,412,124.22</b>	<b>509</b>

50. The Bureau asked states and jurisdictions to report whether they adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (NIST Framework)<sup>101</sup> for networks that support one or more PSAPs. As detailed in Table 24, 16 states and the District of Columbia reported that they do adhere to the NIST Framework; three states, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they do not; and 28 states and Puerto Rico indicated they did not know.

**Table 24 – Adherence to the NIST Cybersecurity Framework**

State	State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction.		
	Yes	No	Reported “Unknown”
AK			X
AL	X		
AR			X
AZ			X
CA	X		
CO	X		
CT		X	
DE	X		
FL	X		
GA			X
HI			X
IA	X		
ID			X

<sup>101</sup> See National Institute of Standards and Technology, *Cybersecurity Framework*, <https://www.nist.gov/cyberframework> (last visited Nov. 14, 2019).

IL			X
IN	X		
KS			
KY			X
LA			X
MA			X
MD	X		
ME			X
MI	X		
MN		X	
MO			X
MS			X
MT			X
NC	X		
ND			X
NE			X
NH	X		
NJ			X
NM			X
NV			
NY			X
OH			X
OK			X
OR	X		
PA			X
RI	X		
SC			X
SD	X		
TN			X
TX			
UT		X	
VA			X
VT	X		
WA	X		
WI			X
WV			X
WY			X
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>			
AS			
DC	X		

Guam		X	
NMI			
PR			X
USVI		X	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>29</b>

#### **K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

51. The Bureau asked respondents to provide “an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria [the] state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges.” Of the jurisdictions that responded, 36 described some effort to measure the effectiveness of 911/E911 fund expenditures. Responses varied from descriptions of how funds had been spent on NG911 to state plans with metrics describing improvements to the 911 system.

52. Some states indicate that measuring effectiveness lies with local organizations. Minnesota states that “[e]ach county and city or other governmental entity . . . shall conduct an annual audit on the use of funds distributed to it for enhanced 911 service.”<sup>102</sup> Mississippi states that oversight responsibility rests solely with the local board of supervisors and that “[t]herefore, the supervisors measure the effective utilization of 911/E911 usage and whether those efforts are meeting the standards and needs of their citizens.”<sup>103</sup>

53. In December 2016, the Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (Task Force), an expert advisory committee the Commission formed in 2014, completed its work on a comprehensive set of recommendations on actions that state, local, and tribal 911 authorities can take to optimize PSAP cybersecurity, network architecture, and funding.<sup>104</sup> Included in the Task Force’s report are detailed recommendations for state and local NG911 planning and budgeting and a common NG911 “scorecard” to enable jurisdictions to assess the progress and maturity of their NG911 implementations. We anticipate that as states and other jurisdictions incorporate these guidelines into their planning, future fee reports will provide enhanced information on the effective utilization of 911/E911 fees.

#### **L. Public Comments on 2018 Tenth Annual Report**

54. As in past reports, this section summarizes public comments received in response to the prior year’s report. On December 19, 2018 the Commission issued a Public Notice seeking comment on

---

<sup>102</sup> Minnesota Response at 24.

<sup>103</sup> Mississippi Response at 23.

<sup>104</sup> See FCC, *Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (TFOPA)*, <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/advisory-committees/general/task-force-optimal-public-safety-answering-point> (last visited Nov. 14, 2019).



the 2018 Tenth Annual Report and the sufficiency and accuracy of the reported information.<sup>105</sup> We received input from five commenters.<sup>106</sup>

55. We sought comment on the sufficiency and accuracy of the Tenth Report's finding that six states and one territory diverted or transferred a portion of collected 911 fees and charges for non-911 related purposes in 2017.<sup>107</sup> We also sought comment on the sufficiency and accuracy of additional information concerning the specific impact, if any, that such diversion has had on the provision of 911 service in those states.<sup>108</sup> CTIA agrees that Nevada's use of 911 fees to purchase body cameras is not in support of 911.<sup>109</sup> CTIA states that the Tenth Report demonstrates that the amount of 911 fee diversions more than doubled from the Ninth Report - from \$129 million in 2016 to \$284.9 million in 2017.<sup>110</sup> CTIA states that "the nearly \$285 million in 9-1-1 fees diverted by seven jurisdictions amounts to 30 percent more than the \$198.9 million altogether invested nationally in NG911 programs in 2017."<sup>111</sup> The New Jersey Wireless Association (NJWA) states that while the Commission reports that New Jersey has been diverting funds since 2014, NJWA has determined that New Jersey has been diverting these funds since 2006.<sup>112</sup> NJWA states that, since 2009, New Jersey has not contributed any collected funds to any of the PSAPs that answer the vast majority of 911 calls.<sup>113</sup>

56. We sought comment on whether there have been any other instances of fee diversion by states or local jurisdictions not identified in the Report, including counties or other jurisdictions in states that have local or hybrid fee collection programs.<sup>114</sup> While we didn't receive specific comment on other instances of fee diversion, CTIA notes that the limited visibility into disbursements at the local level may obscure additional diversion of 911 fees.<sup>115</sup>

57. We sought comment on potential ways to dissuade states and other jurisdictions from instituting 911 fee diversion.<sup>116</sup> APCO states that ending fee diversion will not ensure emergency communications centers have the resources they need for NG911 deployment and significant federal funding is necessary to modernize the nation's 911 systems.<sup>117</sup> COPUC states that how states spend 911

---

<sup>105</sup> *FCC Seeks Public Comment on Tenth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges*, Public Notice, 33 FCC Rcd 12275 (PSHSB 2018) (*Public Notice*), <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-seeks-comment-tenth-annual-report-congress-state-911-fees>.

<sup>106</sup> The Commission received comments from APCO, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (COPUC), and CTIA, and reply comments from the Boulder Regional Emergency Telephone Service Authority (BRETSA) and the New Jersey Wireless Association (NJWA).

<sup>107</sup> *Public Notice*, 33 FCC Rcd at 12275. The six states were Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. The territory was the U.S. Virgin Islands. *Id.* n.3.

<sup>108</sup> *Public Notice*, 33 FCC Rcd at 12275.

<sup>109</sup> CTIA Comments at 6.

<sup>110</sup> *Id.* at 1, 4.

<sup>111</sup> *Id.* at 1, 5.

<sup>112</sup> NJWA Reply Comments at 2.

<sup>113</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>114</sup> *Public Notice*, 33 FCC Rcd at 12275-6.

<sup>115</sup> CTIA Comments at 6-7.

<sup>116</sup> *Public Notice* at 12276.

<sup>117</sup> APCO Comments at 2.

fees is not a matter for the FCC to resolve.<sup>118</sup> COPUC indicates that the FCC's role should be only to continue to report diversion "so that the citizens and decision-makers of the diverting states and territories may be aware of how their 911 funds are spent."<sup>119</sup> COPUC suggests that, to avoid exceeding its jurisdiction, the Commission "consider asking [NENA] to publish model state 911 fee statutory language, using best practices from existing state statutes."<sup>120</sup>

58. We sought comment on whether states and other jurisdictions have altered practices to avoid losing eligibility to participate in the 2012 Act grant program.<sup>121</sup> While we did not receive comment on any specific cases of altered practices, COPUC states that the current incentive of federal grant funding for non-diverting states and the disincentive created by the FCC identifying diverters is appropriate.<sup>122</sup>

59. We also sought comment on other mechanisms, including Commission action, which can create incentives for states and other jurisdictions to avoid diverting 911 fees to non-911 purposes.<sup>123</sup> CTIA supports the Commission in requiring documentation sufficient to demonstrate that the expenditures (1) support PSAP functions or operations, (2) have a reasonable nexus to PSAPs' ability to receive 9-1-1 calls and/or dispatch emergency responders, or (3) relate to communications infrastructure that connects PSAPs.<sup>124</sup> CTIA also supports the Commission finding that without proper documentation, expenditures should be presumed to be a diversion of 9-1-1 fees.<sup>125</sup> CTIA also calls for guidelines as to what constitute acceptable and unacceptable expenditures.<sup>126</sup> Specifically, CTIA states that it supports rules such as those proposed in the 9-1-1 Fee Integrity Act by the last Congress.<sup>127</sup> Likewise, APCO states that the Commission should provide specific examples of what constitutes diversion in advance of the next information collection.<sup>128</sup>

60. We sought comment on whether NG911 expenditures identified over the past three years are representative of overall NG911 expenditures, whether they indicate a trend in expected future expenditures, and whether the identified expenditures are adequate for implementation of NG911 services and infrastructure nationwide.<sup>129</sup> APCO states that the 911 Fee Report's analysis of NG911 "could be made more useful by providing a comprehensive understanding of what constitutes NG9-1-1, how states are ensuring interoperability, and the approaches being taken to achieve NG9-1-1 capabilities."<sup>130</sup> APCO states that "rather than asking respondents to describe the type and number of ESInets operated, the Commission should ask about the nature and functions provided by NG9-1-1 solutions adopted by the

---

<sup>118</sup> COPUC Comments at 2.

<sup>119</sup> *Id.*

<sup>120</sup> *Id.*

<sup>121</sup> *Public Notice* at 12276.

<sup>122</sup> COPUC Comments at 3.

<sup>123</sup> *Public Notice* at 12276.

<sup>124</sup> CTIA Comments at 1-2, 7-8.

<sup>125</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>126</sup> *Id.* at 2, 8.

<sup>127</sup> *Id.* at 8.

<sup>128</sup> APCO Comments at 3.

<sup>129</sup> *Public Notice* at 12276.

<sup>130</sup> APCO Comments at 3-4.

state,” including, for example, whether deployed systems use “cloud-based call handling or dispatch services [and] real-time text solutions.”<sup>131</sup> APCO states that “[s]tates considering their own options for achieving NG9-1-1 would then benefit from information about the approaches early adopters are taking.”<sup>132</sup> APCO states that more detailed NG911 information could help identify costs that should be imposed upon service providers rather than 911 authorities.<sup>133</sup>

61. COPUC clarifies that even though Colorado did not spend any funds on NG911 and has no knowledge of localities spending funds on NG911, it has reason to believe that localities funded NG911 projects.<sup>134</sup> COPUC states that, based on a filed tariff and a legal settlement, it expects CenturyLink to begin migrating PSAPs to the ESInet by the middle of 2019, and all PSAPs to be migrated 18 months following.<sup>135</sup> In addition, COPUC states that all funding will come from localities with none from the state.<sup>136</sup> COPUC adds that it intends to use NTIA/NHTSA grant funding to offset those costs and to match the grant with \$1 million from an industry-funded Performance Assurance Program fund that has no state funding.<sup>137</sup> If this plan is completed, COPUC states, every primary PSAP in Colorado will be receiving 911 calls in IP-format via an ESInet by the end of 2020.<sup>138</sup>

62. NJWA states that the money New Jersey has collected for upgrading to a new, more efficient, NG911 technology is being inefficiently applied to support obsolescent hardware, “thereby throwing good money after bad.”<sup>139</sup> NJWA also states that New Jersey was expected to announce an RFP for an NG911 system during 2018 and that the RFP was associated with a planned increase in the collection of 911 fees.<sup>140</sup> However, according to NJWA, the planned fee increase was not approved by the state legislature.<sup>141</sup> As a result, “no such system will benefit the residents of our state at this time.”<sup>142</sup> NJWA agrees with APCO and others that the Commission should define NG911 service with clarity and issue guidance about what does and does not constitute diversion of 911 fees.<sup>143</sup>

63. We noted that many states continue to lack auditing authority regarding 911 fees, and we sought comment on the impact that this lack of auditing authority has on these states and local entities and any additional barriers to their effective oversight of fee collection.<sup>144</sup> COPUC states that “there is a division of responsibility for oversight of 911 services at the federal, state and local government levels, with overlap in some areas [such as] overseeing network reliability, outage reporting, and outage

---

<sup>131</sup> *Id.* at 4-5.

<sup>132</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>133</sup> *Id.*

<sup>134</sup> COPUC Comments at 3.

<sup>135</sup> *Id.*

<sup>136</sup> *Id.*

<sup>137</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>138</sup> COPUC Comments at 4.

<sup>139</sup> NJWA Reply Comments at 2.

<sup>140</sup> *Id.*

<sup>141</sup> *Id.*

<sup>142</sup> *Id.*

<sup>143</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>144</sup> *Public Notice* at 12276.

mitigation.”<sup>145</sup> According to COPUC, “the actual handling of 911 calls by public safety telecommunicators, and how state-authorized 911 surcharge funds are spent . . . is an area that is solely the responsibility of state and local governments.”<sup>146</sup> In addition, COPUC states that even though Colorado has no auditing authority, state law gives local 911 governing bodies the authority to, at their own expense, “require an annual audit of the service supplier’s books and records concerning the collection and remittance of the charge authorized by this article.”<sup>147</sup> COPUC urges the Commission to clarify that local authorities are not preempted from performing their own audits so that they have some assurance that they will recoup what are, for them, large audit costs.<sup>148</sup>

64. Finally, we received a handful of comments on general and miscellaneous topics. APCO states that for Eleventh Annual Report, the Commission should revise the information collection questionnaire or, if it is unable to do so prior to expiration of the OMB PRA authorization in 2021, provide additional guidance to increase the usefulness of responses received.<sup>149</sup> COPUC states that the Commission should consider adding the topics of state MLTS implementation and how state statutes differ from or complement Kari’s Law.<sup>150</sup> COPUC also suggests obtaining information about non-surcharge-based 911 funding.<sup>151</sup> The Boulder Regional Emergency Telephone Service Authority (BRETSA), as last year, urges the Commission to “adopt regulations and/or develop information which will (i) make auditing of 9-1-1 fee remittances feasible for local and state authorities, (ii) identify whether there is under-remittance of 9-1-1 fees on prepaid service, and (iii) address application of 9-1-1 fee requirements to evolving technologies and markets.”<sup>152</sup>

## **V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2019 ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT**

65. Following submission of this report to Congress, the Commission will make the report public and will formally seek public comment on it. We will include any pertinent information from public comments in next year’s report.

---

<sup>145</sup> COPUC Comments at 1-2.

<sup>146</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>147</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>148</sup> *Id.* at 4-5.

<sup>149</sup> APCO Comments at 2.

<sup>150</sup> COPUC Comments at 5.

<sup>151</sup> *Id.*

<sup>152</sup> BRETSA Reply Comments at 1.

## Appendix A

### Summary of State Responses Regarding Collections during 2018 Annual Period

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service	Total 911 Funds Collected	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
			(2018 Annual Period)	(2018 Annual Period)	(2018 Annual Period)		(2018 Annual Period)	
AK	Local	Local	\$14,200,671.60	[No Response]	\$0.00	No	[NA]	0.00%
AL	State	Hybrid	\$106,276,266.00	\$116,456,606.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$7,308,352.21	6.28%
AR	Hybrid	Hybrid	[No Response]	Unknown	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
AZ	State	State	\$17,364,937.00	\$16,127,404.92	\$0.00	Yes	\$3,829,669.59	23.75%
CA	State	State	\$108,206,000.00	[No Response]	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,950,000.00	[Could not calculate]
CO	Hybrid	Local	[Unknown]	\$74,243,804.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$12,050,472.00	16.23%
CT	State	#N/A	\$29,770,052.54	\$27,359,069.92	\$0.00	Yes	\$10,577,263.00	38.66%
DE	State	Hybrid	\$9,400,000.00	\$9,151,657.13	\$0.00	Yes	\$3,300,000.00	36.06%
FL	State	Hybrid	\$222,556,957.00	\$117,947,467.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$9,291,732.00	7.88%
GA	Hybrid	Local	Unknown	\$21,473,447.69	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
HI	State	State	Unknown	\$11,600,900.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,000,000.00	43.10%
IA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$152,707,692.38	\$39,349,122.76	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,319,726.90	13.52%
ID	Hybrid	Local	Unknown at aggregated State Level	\$24,172,149.03	\$0.00	Yes	\$0.00	0.00%
IL	Hybrid	Hybrid	Local 9-1-1 Authorities report \$315,803,099 in 9-1-1 expenses and the State incurred	\$357,853,280.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$167,534.80	0.047%

			\$11,654,073 for 9-1-1 network costs. Totaling \$327,457,172 in 9-1-1 Expenses. (Includes City of Chicago expenses)					
IN	State	Hybrid	\$194,787,842.05	\$88,906,439.42	\$0.00	Yes	\$15,000,000.00	16.87%
KS	State	Hybrid	\$105,737,626.00	\$23,361,953.98	\$0.00	Yes	\$6,520,318.71	27.91%
KY	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$116,658,319.64	\$56,867,706.91	\$0.00	Yes	\$3,143,378.30	5.53%
LA	Hybrid	Local	\$89,897,893.74	\$92,275,591.00	\$0.00	Yes	[Unknown]	0.00%
MA	State	State	\$38,645,635.00	\$105,511,936.19	\$0.00	Yes	\$36,661,465.00	34.75%
MD	State	State	\$115,533,085.96	\$55,880,354.81	\$0.00	Yes	\$10,046,499.47	17.98%
ME	State	State	\$6,830,314.11	\$8,533,879.39	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,197,872.54	60.91%
MI	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$265,304,540.83	\$38,924,594.66	\$0.00	Yes	\$2,676,733.13	6.88%
MN	State	State	\$9,499,055.98	\$70,820,781.96	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,536,720.58	7.82%
MO	Local	Local	Unknown	Unknown	\$0.00	No	[NA]	0.00%
MS	Local	Local	\$64,819,628.69	\$29,759,156.39	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
MT	State	#N/A	NA	\$13,000,000.00	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
NC	State	State	\$126,224,104.00	\$88,279,782.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$134,223.00	0.15%
ND	Hybrid	Local	\$18,500,000.00	\$14,672,353.24	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,789,887.00	12.20%
NE	Hybrid	Hybrid	Unknown	\$13,541,989.54	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
NH	State	State	\$13,840,223.97	\$15,543,492.35	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
NJ	State	State	Unknown	\$122,905,000.00	\$92,083,000.00	Yes	\$175,000.00	0.14%
NM	State	State	\$8,561,378.39	\$11,228,627.48	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
NV	Local	Local	\$7,562,104.00	\$1,122,186.78	[Unknown]	Yes	\$152,581.00	13.60%
NY	Local	Local	\$1,104,060,030.00	NA	\$83,503,938.92	Yes	\$120,283.00	[Could not calculate]

OH	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$354,344,576.66	\$33,421,679.22	\$0.00	Yes	\$200,000.00	0.60%
OK	Hybrid	Hybrid	~\$90,500,000.00	\$44,712,874.00	\$0.00	Yes	[No Response]	0.00%
OR	Hybrid	State	\$146,170,610.59	\$45,550,841.00	\$0.00	Yes	NA	0.00%
PA	State	Hybrid	\$348,920,207.00	\$316,216,704.00	\$0.00	Yes	[Unknown]	0.00%
RI	State	State	\$5,186,447.00	\$15,684,553.00	\$10,498,106.00	Yes	\$468,453.09	2.99%
SC	Hybrid	Hybrid	[NA]	\$31,274,226.93	\$0.00	Yes	[No Response]	0.00%
SD	State	Hybrid	\$27,481,502.00	\$13,306,863.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$4,005,623.00	30.10%
TN	State	Hybrid	\$113,898,014.00	Unknown	\$0.00	Yes	\$15,777,517.00	[Could not calculate]
TX	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$283,736,341.25	\$220,165,001.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$28,474,393.00	12.93%
UT	State	Hybrid	\$65,000,000.00	\$29,262,881.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,500,000.00	5.13%
VA	State	Hybrid	Unknown	\$60,974,471.93	\$0.00	Yes	\$6,827,311.00	11.20%
VT	State	State	\$4,831,183.00	TBD	\$0.00	Yes	\$4,831,183.00	[Could not calculate]
WA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$150,000,000.00	\$99,923,008.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$7,349,248.00	7.35%
WI	#N/A	#N/A	Unknown	Unknown	\$0.00	Yes	\$66,145.00	[Could not calculate]
WV	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$73,631,161.00	\$63,686,697.00	\$1,000,000.00	Yes	\$7,358,115.00	11.55%
WY	#N/A	Local	[Unknown]	Unknown	\$0.00	Yes	According to Title 16, Chapter 9 of the Wyoming State Statutes for the emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign over-sight responsibility to a state-level agency for 9-1-	0.00%

							1 services. (16-9- 102(a)(iv).	
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>								
AS	#N/A	#N/A	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$0.00	[No Response]	[No Response]	0.00%
DC	State	Hybrid	\$47,708,266.55	\$11,832,609.15	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,624,172.16	13.73%
Guam	State	#N/A	\$1,490,964.00	\$2,183,715.71	\$0.00	Yes	[NA]	0.00%
Northern Mariana Islands	#N/A	#N/A	[No Response]	[No Response]	\$0.00	[No Response]	[No Response]	0.00%
PR	State	State	\$13,864,255.12	\$20,204,116.46	\$0.00	No	\$106,180.80	0.53%
USVI	State	#N/A	\$3,966,163.00	[No Response]	\$0.00	No	[NA]	0.00%



**Appendix B**  
**Overview of Total State 911 Fees - 2009 to 2019 Reports<sup>153</sup>**

State	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report
AK	DNP	\$8,199,046	\$8,649,083	\$12,320,888	\$12,256,620	\$12,448,651	\$13,969,231	\$12,837,114	\$11,595,445	\$15,211,064.24	[No Response]
AL	\$60,465,104	\$29,857,571	\$28,680,846	\$28,401,585	\$28,401,585	\$41,974,724	\$108,787,856	\$116,440,103	\$115,944,883	\$114,271,364	\$116,456,606.00
AR	\$24,799,338	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	\$25,290,790	\$26,985,555	\$20,161,873	\$22,734,249	Unknown
AZ	\$15,056,353	\$17,460,160	\$16,238,766	\$16,747,691	\$16,445,301	\$16,628,695	\$17,589,404	\$19,227,222	\$20,389,514	\$16,991,893	\$16,127,404.92
CA	\$106,817,447	\$101,450,093	\$100,000,000	\$85,952,018	\$82,126,695	\$75,714,948	\$97,077,234	\$87,838,234	\$79,648,535	\$76,916,882	[No Response]
CO	\$45,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$1,907,087	\$42,900,000	\$42,900,000	\$52,257,085	\$52,732,731	\$53,987,426	\$58,574,919	\$74,243,804.00
CT	\$20,116,091	\$21,397,573	\$20,723,228	\$22,413,228	\$24,001,890	\$35,755,788	\$37,176,000	\$32,564,308	\$1,658,219.00	\$28,651,232.63	\$27,359,069.92
DE	DNP	\$2,259,728	\$8,044,859	\$8,775,757	\$7,623,392	\$7,786,659	\$8,159,730	\$8,159,730	\$8,718,169	\$8,246,009	\$9,151,657.13
FL	\$130,962,053	\$125,531,674	\$123,059,300	\$122,550,767	\$108,896,142	\$107,884,715	\$108,324,754	\$108,226,957	\$111,799,871	\$114,480,143	\$117,947,467.00
GA	DNP	\$8,537,319	\$8,950,569	\$13,700,097	DNP	\$18,462,645	\$17,538,556	\$17,659,037	\$19,840,298	\$14,969,525	\$21,473,447.69
HI	\$8,842,841	\$9,578,764	\$9,544,397	\$9,755,031	\$10,020,045	\$9,599,983	\$10,489,700	\$10,237,032	\$10,634,306	\$11,700,000	\$11,600,900.00
IA	\$29,054,622	\$31,458,531	\$31,304,377	\$30,664,253	\$30,297,168	\$20,657,733	\$27,820,552	\$40,547,767	\$39,849,592	\$39,920,992	\$39,349,122.76
ID	\$19,191,410	\$18,673,809	\$18,013,902	\$17,013,000	\$19,313,000	\$20,768,995	\$20,879,778	\$20,952,379	\$22,456,722	\$22,401,523	\$24,172,149.03
IL	DNP	\$67,000,000	\$69,700,000	\$71,900,000	\$69,200,000	\$71,200,000	\$213,983,628	\$95,500,349	\$234,070,304	\$169,572,608	\$357,853,280.00
IN	\$71,000,000	\$39,600,000	\$30,000,000	DNP	\$69,515,800	\$73,114,656	\$72,075,593	\$79,108,858	\$86,865,020	\$87,125,936	\$88,906,439.42
KS	DNP	\$6,705,539	DNP	\$22,125,937	\$20,477,020	\$20,573,217	\$20,337,748	\$20,821,974	\$19,193,708	\$22,900,621	\$23,361,953.98
KY	\$23,569,921	\$22,979,828	\$54,900,000	\$56,500,000	\$55,700,000	\$53,506,843	\$53,920,232	\$53,500,000	\$111,089,076	\$59,093,367	\$56,867,706.91
LA	DNP	DNP	\$3,017,672	Did Not File	\$4,912,926	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$42,750,000	\$66,235,990	\$88,718,075	\$92,275,591.00

<sup>153</sup> “DNP” indicates that the state or jurisdiction filed a report but did not provide the information.

MA	DNP	\$69,694,702	\$75,125,185	\$73,408,835	\$73,677,263	\$74,561,728	\$74,947,715	\$95,508,773	\$117,883,899	\$102,917,091	\$105,511,936.19
MD	\$57,176,923	\$55,556,616	\$54,560,255	\$52,099,601	\$52,240,761	\$51,716,232	\$54,766,848	\$53,314,406	\$53,974,012	\$55,852,809	\$55,880,354.81
ME	\$6,664,062	\$6,108,985	\$7,786,855	\$8,416,235	\$8,342,459	\$8,034,327	\$8,340,150	\$8,402,473	\$8,506,670	\$8,452,998	\$8,533,879.39
MI	\$69,835,672	\$93,000,132	\$87,673,893	\$196,215,849	\$181,204,131	\$178,224,826	\$88,932,891	\$93,333,483	\$102,388,366	\$103,526,157	\$38,924,594.66
MN	\$51,281,641	\$51,269,514	\$58,821,937	\$58,654,182	\$62,353,897	\$62,056,116	\$61,446,108	\$62,110,858	\$76,542,107	\$77,151,433	\$70,820,781.96
MO	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	~	Unknown
MS	\$11,758,733	DNP	\$56,335,986	\$60,813,014	\$65,290,042	\$58,175,490	\$31,280,357	\$26,510,538	\$31,884,472	\$31,533,680	\$29,759,156.39
MT	\$13,172,462	\$13,172,462	\$13,715,064	\$13,626,940	\$13,177,752	\$13,099,542	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	Did Not File	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000.00
NC	\$84,613,672	\$87,367,015	\$80,001,662	DNP	\$69,424,897	\$71,688,784	\$78,161,246	\$81,135,377	\$81,801,499	\$82,891,066	\$88,279,782.00
ND	DNP	\$8,369,366	DNP	\$9,506,000	\$9,506,000	\$9,998,322	\$10,337,907	\$10,337,907	\$12,814,683	\$14,607,294	\$14,672,353.24
NE	\$13,278,907	\$5,507,240	\$8,128,042	\$14,808,421	\$15,555,734	\$15,663,631	\$13,940,368	\$13,900,448	\$14,061,973	\$8,282,774	\$13,541,989.54
NH	\$10,854,203	DNP	\$9,832,831	Did Not File	\$10,493,486	\$10,467,787	\$10,582,269	\$12,317,418	\$15,288,598	\$15,427,022	\$15,543,492.35
NJ	\$130,000,000	\$128,900,000	Did Not File	\$125,000,000	\$126,000,000	\$121,000,000	\$120,000,000	\$122,632,000	\$122,150,000	\$121,909,000	\$122,905,000.00
NM	\$12,786,328	\$12,073,923	\$13,081,062	\$13,424,002	\$12,028,770	\$11,970,079	\$11,600,163	\$11,146,012	\$10,919,490	\$11,203,574	\$11,228,627.48
NV	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	\$2,010,342	\$1,944,447	DNP	\$1,591,367	\$437,144	\$2,291,101.90	\$1,122,186.78
NY	\$83,700,000	DNP	\$193,194,759	\$194,787,113	\$190,281,716	\$183,219,891	\$185,513,240	\$185,262,082	Did Not File	\$189,094,916.20	NA
OH	\$28,544,924	\$28,164,050	\$29,175,929	DNP	\$28,837,121	\$25,689,296	\$25,736,970	\$40,382,365	\$44,720,083	\$39,736,489	\$33,421,679.22
OK	DNP	Did Not File	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Did Not File	\$34,986,975.3	\$44,712,874.00
OR	\$87,447,640	\$40,155,054	\$39,592,560	\$39,370,086	\$39,229,319	\$39,115,990	\$39,470,386	\$39,470,386	\$42,832,475	\$43,919,835	\$45,550,841.00
PA	\$190,239,805	\$116,656,193	\$194,554,260	\$192,297,459	\$184,044,508	\$192,779,782	\$190,711,113	\$239,800,218	\$315,963,650	\$316,592,551	\$316,216,704.00
RI	\$19,400,000	\$18,200,000	\$15,488,729	Did Not File	\$16,500,000	\$17,454,000	\$17,640,703	\$16,345,364	\$14,021,695	\$16,817,000	\$15,684,553.00
SC	\$22,000,000	DNP	\$21,988,052	\$22,215,748	\$28,948,882	\$27,690,958	\$28,458,896	\$39,054,282	\$40,880,762	\$30,108,371	\$31,274,226.93
SD	DNP	DNP	\$8,100,000	\$8,200,000	\$9,111,476	\$13,275,031	\$13,095,234	\$13,093,702	\$12,976,019	\$13,087,266	\$13,306,863.00
TN	\$51,536,089	\$55,965,000	\$58,500,000	\$94,497,881	\$60,852,140	\$98,199,801	\$67,404,840	\$78,729,854	\$102,699,664	\$102,819,090	Unknown
TX	\$197,228,796	\$203,547,360	\$199,025,787	\$209,202,098	\$212,788,623	\$213,215,483	\$208,478,516	\$222,938,735	\$223,315,125	\$219,673,860	\$220,165,001.00

UT	\$23,366,301	\$2,724,374	\$23,909,566	\$23,070,307	\$26,188,051	\$29,354,710	\$24,572,000	\$27,130,872	\$27,162,203	\$23,485,454	\$29,262,881.00
VA	DNP	\$52,022,170	\$53,217,635	\$54,079,487	\$51,658,843	\$55,212,204	\$85,187,560	\$85,431,606	\$86,028,766	\$86,909,858	\$60,974,471.93
VT	\$4,832,374	\$5,487,046	\$4,605,803	\$4,993,132	\$5,416,336	\$4,628,027	DNP	\$6,256,658	\$6,170,851	\$5,981,135	TBD
WA	\$69,523,163	\$71,036,718	\$71,244,435	\$100,952,115	\$95,417,114	\$95,887,087	\$91,529,550	\$94,445,461	\$95,242,119	\$98,653,163	\$99,923,008.00
WI	\$9,602,745	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	0	Unknown
WV	\$32,278,728	\$33,760,563	\$35,375,580	\$36,176,377	\$37,928,204	\$58,001,075	\$56,323,471	\$56,649,322	\$56,340,460	\$60,189,650	\$63,686,697.00
WY	\$6,700,000	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Unknown	Unknown
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>											
AS	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Did Not File	Did Not File	DNP	DNP	Does Not Collect Fees	Does Not Collect Fees	[No Response]
DC	\$12,744,103	\$12,714,347	\$12,700,000	DNP	\$12,064,842	\$13,700,000	\$10,488,988	\$12,189,231	\$11,354,347	\$11,428,063.63	\$11,832,609.15
Guam	\$1,468,363	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$1,779,710	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$2,209,374	\$2,183,715.71
NMI	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File		\$0
PR	\$20,952,459	\$21,876,277	Did Not File	\$21,367,260	\$20,323,324	\$19,507,889	Did Not File	\$21,896,789	Did Not File	19889005.73	\$20,204,116.46
USVI	Did Not File	\$590,812	\$554,245	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$1,297,671	\$1,416,865	Did Not Specify	[No Response]
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,877,863,272</b>	<b>\$1,749,609,554</b>	<b>\$2,002,117,111</b>	<b>\$2,149,689,191</b>	<b>\$2,322,983,616</b>	<b>\$2,404,510,788</b>	<b>\$2,527,625,361</b>	<b>\$2,631,705,009</b>	<b>\$2,763,916,948</b>	<b>\$2,937,108,459</b>	<b>\$2,675,270,975.95</b>

**Appendix C**  
**State 911 Fees by Service Type**

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
State	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
AK	Wireline	Up to 2.00 per phone		X		
	Wireless	Up to 2.00 per phone		X		
	Prepaid	NA				X
	VoIP	N/A				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
AL	Wireline	\$1.75	X			
	Wireless	\$1.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.75	X			
	VoIP	\$1.75	X			
	Other	\$1.75	X			
AR	Wireline	amount up to five percent (5%) or for any counties with a population fewer than 27,500 the amount may be up to twelve percent (12%) of the tariff rate (Note: Four Arkansas Counties have not levied the wireline surcharge.)				X
	Wireless	\$0.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.65 (per transaction at point of sale)	X			
	VoIP	\$0.65	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
AZ	Wireline	\$.20 per month for each activated wireline service account	X			
	Wireless	\$.20 per month for each activated wireless service account	X			
	Prepaid	.80 of one percent from the retail sale of wireless services. Retailer can retain 3% prior to submittal	X			
	VoIP	Same as wireline service account	X			
	Other	None				X
CA	Wireline	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			

	Wireless	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Prepaid	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	VoIP	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Other	NA				X
CO	Wireline	50¢ to \$2.00 per access line per month		X		
	Wireless	50¢ to \$2.00 per access line per month		X		
	Prepaid	1.4% of retail sales	X			
	VoIP	50¢ to \$2.00 per access line per month		X		
	Other	NA				X
CT	Wireline	\$0.58-\$0.57*	X			
	Wireless	\$0.58/\$0.57	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.58/\$0.57	X			
	VoIP	\$0.58/\$0.57	X			
	Other	[No Response]	X			
DE	Wireline	60 cents per line	X			
	Wireless	60 cents per line	X			
	Prepaid	60 cents per line	X			
	VoIP	60 cents per line	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
FL	Wireline	\$0.40	X			
	Wireless	\$0.40	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.40	X			
	VoIP	\$0.40	X			
	Other	NA				X
GA	Wireline	\$1.50/mo		X		
	Wireless	\$1.50/mo		X		
	Prepaid	\$0.75/mo		X		
	VoIP	\$1.50/mo		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
HI	Wireline	\$0.27/user/month				X
	Wireless	\$0.66/user/month	X			
	Prepaid	[NA]				X
	VoIP	\$0.66/user/month	X			
	Other	[NA]				X
IA	Wireline	\$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$1.00				X

	Prepaid	\$0.51				X
	VoIP	\$1.00/line/month		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
ID	Wireline	\$1.00 or \$1.25		X		
	Wireless	\$1.00 or \$1.25		X		
	Prepaid	2.5% Point of sale each transaction		X		
	VoIP	\$1.00 or \$1.25		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
IL	Wireline	\$1.50; \$5.00 for City of Chicago (local authority)	X			
	Wireless	\$1.50; \$5.00 for City of Chicago (local authority)	X			
	Prepaid	0.03%; 0.09% for City of Chicago (local authority)			X	
	VoIP	\$1.50; \$5.00 for City of Chicago (local authority)	X			
	Other	NA				X
IN	Wireline	\$1.00	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00	X			
	Other	\$1.00	X			
KS	Wireline	\$0.60 per subscriber			X	
	Wireless	\$0.60 per subscriber				X
	Prepaid	1.20% of total retail transaction for service			X	
	VoIP	\$0.60 per subscriber account			X	
	Other	\$0.60 per subscriber account			X	
KY	Wireline	Varies by county. [See Kentucky 911 Services Board FY 2018 Annual Report, Appendix C: Local Wireline Fees (page 27) (attached with Submission)]		X		
	Wireless	\$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.93 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	Varies by county, treated as wireline (see wireline).		X		

	Other	[See Kentucky 911 Services Board FY 2018 Annual Report, Appendix C: Local Wireline Fees (page 27) for a detailed list of payment schemes (attached with Submission)]		X		
LA	Wireline	Up to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange		X		
	Wireless	Up to \$1.25 for all Parishes except for Jefferson Parish		X		
	Prepaid	4% Point of Sale	X			
	VoIP	[No Response]		X		
	Other	NA				X
MA	Wireline	\$1.00 per month for the period ending December 31, 2018.	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00 per month for the period ending December 31, 2018.	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00 per month for the period ending December 31, 2018.	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00 per month for the period ending December 31, 2018.	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
MD	Wireline	\$1.00	X	X		
	Wireless	\$1.00	X	X		
	Prepaid	\$0.60	X	X		
	VoIP	\$1.00	X	X		
	Other	NA				X
ME	Wireline	\$0.45	X			
	Wireless	\$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.45	X			
	VoIP	\$0.45	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
MI	Wireline	\$0.25 State \$0.36 to \$3.00 Local		X	X	
	Wireless	\$0.25 State \$0.36 to \$3.00 Local		X		
	Prepaid	5% State	X			
	VoIP	\$0.25 State \$0.36 to \$3.00 Local		X	X	
	Other	NA				X

MN	Wireline	\$0.95	X			
	Wireless	\$0.95	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.95				X
	VoIP	\$0.95	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
MO	Wireline	None/Unknown			X	
	Wireless	None/Unknown				X
	Prepaid	None/Unknown			X	
	VoIP	None/Unknown			X	
	Other	None/Unknown			X	
MS	Wireline	\$1.00 residential/\$2.00 commercial per line		X		
	Wireless	NA				X
	Prepaid	NA				X
	VoIP	\$1.00 per line		X		
	Other	.05 per line	X			
MT	Wireline	[No Response]				X
	Wireless	[No Response]				X
	Prepaid	[No Response]				X
	VoIP	[No Response]				X
	Other	\$1.00 per subscriber line per month	X			
NC	Wireline	\$0.65	X			
	Wireless	\$0.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.65	X			
	VoIP	\$0.65	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
ND	Wireline	\$1.50-\$2.00		X		
	Wireless	\$1.50-\$2.00		X		
	Prepaid	2.5% of gross receipts @ point of sale	X			
	VoIP	\$1.50-\$2.00		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
NE	Wireline	\$0.50/\$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.01	X			
	VoIP	\$0.50/\$1.00		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
NH	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			



	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
NJ	Wireline	\$.90/Monthly	X			
	Wireless	\$.90/Monthly	X			
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	\$.90/Monthly	X			
	Other	None				X
NM	Wireline	\$.51 per line pre month	X			
	Wireless	\$.51 per line pre month	X			
	Prepaid	1.38 % of the retail transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$.51 per line pre month	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
NV	Wireline	Varies by County		X		
	Wireless	Varies by County		X		
	Prepaid	Varies by County		X		
	VoIP	Varies by County		X		
	Other	Varies by County				X
NY	Wireline	\$0.35 [except for Tompkins County, Onondaga County, and New York City, where fee is \$1]				X
	Wireless	[No Response]				X
	Prepaid	[No Response]				X
	VoIP	\$0.35 [except for Tompkins County, Onondaga County, and New York City, where fee is \$1]				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
OH	Wireline	[No Response]				X
	Wireless	25 cents per cell phone per month				X
	Prepaid	.05% at sale				X
	VoIP	[No Response]				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
OK	Wireline	3% - 15% of the base tariff rate		X		
	Wireless	.75 cents per device per month	X			
	Prepaid	.75 cents per device per month	X			
	VoIP	.75 cents per connection per month	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X

OR	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
PA	Wireline	\$1.65		X		
	Wireless	\$1.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.65	X			
	VoIP	\$1.65	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
RI	Wireline	\$1.00/month per device	X			
	Wireless	\$1.26/month per device	X			
	Prepaid	2.5% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	Included in wireless				X
	Other	None				X
SC	Wireline	\$0.45 - \$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$0.62	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.62	X			
	VoIP	\$0.45 - \$1.00		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
SD	Wireline	\$1.25/line	X	X		
	Wireless	\$1.25/line	X	X		
	Prepaid	2% point of sale	X	X		
	VoIP	\$1.25/line	X	X		
	Other	None				X
TN	Wireline	\$1.16	X			
	Wireless	\$1.16	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.16	X			
	VoIP	\$1.16	X			
	Other	\$1.16	X			

TX	Wireline	CSEC 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC): The wireline fee is set by CSEC at \$0.50 per access line/month (the rate is capped by statute at \$0.50). ECDs: Res: \$0.20 - \$1.56 per local exchange access line/month. Bus: \$0.46 - \$7.50 per access line/month, up to a 100-line maximum in most ECD service areas. Bus. Trunk: \$0.50 to \$7.56. Several ECDs' wireline fee is imposed as a percentage of the charges for base service; typically set at 6% – 8%.				X
	Wireless	State wireless 9-1-1 fee: \$0.50 per month per wireless telecommunications connection.	X			
	Prepaid	State prepaid wireless 9-1-1 fee: 2% of the purchase price of each prepaid	X			
	VoIP	Wireline rates applicable.				X
	Other	State equalization surcharge: \$0.06/month per local exchange access line access line or wireless telecommunications connection (excluding connections that constitute prepaid wireless telecommunications service).	X			
UT	Wireline	80 cents			X	
	Wireless	80 cents				X
	Prepaid	3.30% of the sales price per transaction (§69-2-405)			X	
	VoIP	80 cents			X	
	Other	NA				X
VA	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.50	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X
VT	Wireline	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			

	Wireless	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	Prepaid	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	VoIP	By agreement	X			
	Other	NA				X
WA	Wireline	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per month	X	X	X	
	Wireless	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per month	X	X		
	Prepaid	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per retail transaction	X	X	X	
	VoIP	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per month	X	X	X	
	Other	[No Response]				X
WI	Wireline	Varies by county		X		
	Wireless	None				X
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	None				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
WV	Wireline	[See Submission at 15-17 for table showing county fees]		X		
	Wireless	\$3.34 per wireless line				X
	Prepaid	6% Tax	X			
	VoIP	[See Submission at 15-17 for table showing county fees]		X		
	Other	[No Response]				X
WY	Wireline	Up to \$0.75 per line established county-by-county				X
	Wireless	Up to \$0.75 per line established county-by-county				X
	Prepaid	1.5% @ Point of Sale				X
	VoIP	Up to \$0.75 per line established county-by-county				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	Wireline	[No Response]				
	Wireless	[No Response]				
	Prepaid	[No Response]				
	VoIP	[No Response]				
	Other	[No Response]				

DC	Wireline	\$0.76 per line	X			
	Wireless	\$0.76 per line	X			
	Prepaid	Two percent of the sales price per retail transaction occurring in the District, including sales made over the internet.	X			
	VoIP	\$0.76 for each line, trunk, or path	X			
	Other	\$0.62 per Centrex line in the District of Columbia and \$0.62 per private branch exchange station in the District of Columbia	X			
Guam	Wireline	\$1.00 monthly per acct.				X
	Wireless	\$1.00 monthly per acct.				X
	Prepaid	\$1.00 monthly per acct.				X
	VoIP	NA				X
	Other	NA				X
NMI	Wireline	[No Response]				X
	Wireless	[No Response]				X
	Prepaid	[No Response]				X
	VoIP	[No Response]				X
	Other	[No Response]				X
PR	Wireline	.50¢ a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Wireless	.50¢ a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Prepaid	.50¢ a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	VoIP	.50¢ a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers State	X			
	Other	NA				X

USVI	Wireline	\$2.00	X			
	Wireless	\$2.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$2.00	X			
	VoIP	\$2.00	X			
	Other	[No Response]				X

## **Appendix D**

**Approved by OMB**

**3060-1122**

**Expires: March 31, 2021**

**Estimated time per response: 10-55  
hours**

### **Annual Collection of Information**

#### **Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions**

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1122, the FCC's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission's obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act:

#### **A. Filing Information**

##### **1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

<b>State or Jurisdiction</b>

##### **2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>

**B. Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**

- 1. Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2018:**

PSAP Type <sup>154</sup>	Total
Primary	
Secondary	
<b>Total</b>	

- 1. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>155</sup> in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2018:**

Number of Active Telecommunicators	Total
Full-Time	
Part-time	

- 2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
------------------------	--

<sup>154</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (*Master Glossary*), Apr. 13, 2018, at 162, available at [https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.22-2018\\_FINAL\\_2.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.22-2018_FINAL_2.pdf).

<sup>155</sup> A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. See *Master Glossary* at 192.



**3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

----------------------

**3. Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018.**

Type of Service	Total 911 Calls
Wireline	
Wireless	
VoIP	
Other	
Total	

**C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**

**1. Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)? *Check one.***

- Yes ..... ☐
- No .....

**1a. If YES, provide a citation to the legal authority for such a mechanism.**

----------------------

**1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018, did your state or**

**jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.**

**2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees? *Check one.***

- The State collects the fees ..... ☐
- A Local Authority collects the fees ..... ☐
- A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies  
(e.g., state and local authority) collect the fees ..... ☐

**3. Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

**D. Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**

1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.		
Jurisdiction	Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds (Check one)	
	Yes	No
State	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local (e.g., county, city, municipality)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.)		

2. Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one.*

- Yes ..... ☐
- No ..... ☐

2a. If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.

2b. If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.

**E.     Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**

- 1.   Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

2. Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. <i>Check all that apply.</i>			
Type of Cost		Yes	No
<b>Operating Costs</b>	Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Personnel Costs</b>	Telecommunicators' Salaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Training of Telecommunicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Administrative Costs</b>	Program Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel Expenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Dispatch Costs</b>	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Grant Programs</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> If YES, see 2a.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.			

**F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

<b>1. Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type.</b>		
<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Fee/Charge Imposed</b>	<b>Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance (e.g., state, county, local authority, or a combination)</b>
Wireline		
Wireless		
Prepaid Wireless		
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)		
Other		

- 2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Total Amount Collected (\$)</b>
Wireline	
Wireless	
Prepaid Wireless	
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	
Other	
<b>Total</b>	

**2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

--

3. Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.

--

Question	Yes	No
4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4a. If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.		

5. Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction.	Percent
State 911 Fees	
Local 911 Fees	
General Fund - State	
General Fund - County	
Federal Grants	
State Grants	



**G. Description of Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses**

Question		Yes	No
<b>1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2018, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism? <i>Check one.</i></b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1a. If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.</b>			
<b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b>	<b>Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. <i>(Add lines as necessary)</i></b>		

**H. Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees**

Question	Yes	No
1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1a. If YES, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2018. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)		

Question	Yes	No
2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2018. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)		



3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.					
Type of ESInet	Yes	No	If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet	If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?	
				Yes	No
a. A single, state-wide ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Regional ESInets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	[If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

▪

4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2018.

--

Question	Total PSAPs Accepting Texts
5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?	

Question	Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable
6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?	

**J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended (\$)
1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Question	Total PSAPs
2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?	

Question	Yes	No	Unknown
3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

- 1. Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (*e.g.*, Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of such reports in the space below.**